THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1893.

I.

THE DISHONESTY OF HERESY.

BY PROFESSOR JACOB COOPER, S. T. D., D. C. L., RUTGERS COLLEGE.

THE prophet in predicting the sufferings of Christ, declared that his wounds would be received in the house of His friends. However grievous the thought be, that a man's chief foes are those of his own household, yet such is the power of the devil to work harm to the people of God, that this has always been true of the Church; and must be accepted as a necessary condition under which the Gospel will struggle. History and the words of our Lord confirm this alike; and hence, without being able to fathom the Divine purpose in permitting the fiercest wolves to come from within the nominal fold, we must accept the fact and meet the issue.

If it were with external foes alone that the Church had to fight, the battle would be short and the victory decisive. But since so many depart from the faith they once professed, the world doubts whether any doctrine be sound which can be so caricatured by its pretended followers. And if those still within the fold can with impunity call in question all the distin-

guishing tenets of Christianity, if those set apart to teach its doctrines can ridicule as bigots all who remain steadfast to their creed, if they can assail as uncharitable those who prefer the truth to communion with heretics, what can the Church offer as an inducement to seek her membership? It is not the doctrines of the Bible as they unfold themselves to fair-minded readers, or as the Church embodies them in her confessions, which present so many vulnerable points, as the interpretations put upon these doctrines by their pledged defenders when seeking to justify their own unfaithfulness. Naturally the utterances of those, who, from their position, should be the authorized defenders of a creed, are taken as its true exposition. But when in defiance of solemn vows to inculcate nothing but what their creed contains they teach everything save its obvious meaning, the world takes for granted that all their brethren are equally dishonest—that none in fact believe what they profess.

The perils from false brethren are constant. These create confusion in the body of Christ, and destroy that peace which is essential to spiritual growth. They clothe the Church with dishonor by their unfaithfulness to professed belief; and in giving the enemy cause to blaspheme they hinder the progress of the Gospel among the unbelieving. They remain within the Church as long as possible to enjoy its honors and fatten on its charities, and, when the brethren can endure them no longer, go out heavily laden with plunder. Thus they do their utmost to destroy the mother who nurtured them and gave them all the strength they possess. Certainly this is worse than open warfare; it is more dishonorable than the hostility of the avowed infidel; it is the most poisoned weapon that Satan ever hurled against the Church on earth.

The phases of Heresy are many, and its methods of troubling the Church are constantly changing. Consisting as it does of negations there is no common ground of belief; and it has the special privilege of being inconsistent, and yet always true to its own principle. For as its work is to destroy what others have built up, however unreasonable this may be, since it has

no positive views of its own, he who would answer them must beat the air. Each age of the Church has its special trials from false brethren. For Heresy, like the plague, makes its appearance whenever the air is impure, and spreads among those who have not the strength to resist its attack. The present disease is in the form of Higher Criticism, which aims to prove that the Holy Scriptures are not inerrant; and therefore the Church has no infallible guide, and her Creeds no Divine warrant for their existence. The conduct of some recent disturbers of the peace in the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches makes it pertinent to consider the relations of heretics to the general body of believers; and whether it is common honesty to hold an authoritative position in a religious body, and at the same time teach that which manifestly brings confusion among its members, and if accepted by all would destroy its very existence. For while the subject is not new, since it receives fresh illustration by what is witnessed in our day and relates to a perpetual peril of the Church, there is propriety in calling attention to it as a means of counteracting threatened danger.

NECESSITY FOR A CREED.

The existence of a body of believers involves the idea of a common belief expressed in an intelligible formula of doctrine. For if there be a common Faith there must also be a common understanding of its substance; and this must be expressed in precise, unambiguous words inwrought into a harmonious system. Hence the existence of a creed is a prime necessity, without which there can be no visible Church. And even the scattered members of the invisible Church who are known only to God, and each one to himself by the witness of the Holy Spirit testifying to his conscience, must be one in Christ Jesus. Consequently, if faith form any part of their spiritual life, they too must believe substantially in some creed, however it be expressed. For as there is one Lord so there can be but one faith; and by the one baptism of the Holy Ghost, they must all be inducted into that new life which is nourished by a belief

in the truth. In whatever way this matter be looked at the conclusion must be the same. If there be an objective truth by which the soul is renewed, then the knowledge of this must be taught to the intelligence through the medium of words or their equivalent signs; whether this be by the external means of human instruction, or the inward inspiration of God speaking directly to the heart. For faith implies something upon which the soul rests for support; and this involves knowledge by which it apprehends the fundamental truths which constitute that support, and this knowledge requires intelligible communication by words or their equivalents. And if the foundation be the same in substance for all believers, if they need to be renewed through the same means—all of which is assumed by Christians universally—we are forced to admit that this involves a CREED, or FORM OF SOUND WORDS.

It is undoubtedly true that a man may be a Christian though he have but an obscure idea of the truths of revelation. Perhaps he is not able intellectually to have any other sort; but this does not prove the desirableness of being an ignorant believer. With this knowledge, as with any other, clearness and vigor of apprehension are main elements. Sharply defined grasp of scientific truth is certainly to be sought above all things else by such as are studying any subject of human knowledge. Many who profess knowledge of a given science have succeeded in acquiring only a cloudy, ambiguous apprehension of it; but this is their misfortune. It is certainly the best recommendation of a scientific treatise, that it embodies, as far as possible, two things: 1st. The whole sum of truths as far as known touching the given subject. 2d. That these truths are systematized in the clearest and tersest language. Nor is it any less necessary to aim at this result because some things relating to the science be not yet clearly understood; or even if parts of it be in dispute. Still, that treatise which best satisfies the conditions named is the most valuable system in itself, and most acceptable to all who wish to master the subject matter of which it treats.

The case is precisely so in spiritual things. To enable us to reach this result we have a Guide, infallible in its statements, all comprehensive in its reach, and offering unequalled facilities for being reduced to system. The truths it contains start from a central idea of God the Creator, and man the creature. Proceeding from this co-ordinate notion, we have the relations of these two as they work out their results, involving the general laws of moral government, as well as the special interference of Providence in controlling man; and his every act and thought while subject to this control in effecting his discipline for immortality. The knowledge of this subject is the science of Religion; and this necessitates a creed—that precious treasure to every one who wishes to know the truth—that scarecrow and nightmare to such as have no genuine conception of faith, and who measure all others by themselves. Without a creed or its equivalent—call it by what name you please, the idea still remains the same—there could be no Church, no united body of believers, no concerted action, and hence no progress in evangelizing the world. And even if the creed be imperfect, it is still a necessity of our present condition. For we must have a guide to direct ourselves aright, and to teach others. Without this we are in the world as a ship at sea without chart or compass; in darkness with no stars by which to direct our course; tossed about by the currents of passion and every wind of doctrine. We need leading ideas, clearly defined, firmly rooted, easy to remember as a resort in times of danger when beset by sudden temptation, or harassed by doubt. And we must have a secure place to anchor our hopes, a ποῦ στῶ, if we would use the lever of faith to raise ourselves above the present evil world.

STATES REQUIRE A CODE.

States acquire stability only after they have formulated a Constitution or Bill of Rights, as an expression of the principles by which they are governed. No considerable body of men have ever been able to continue in civil society unless they had some common principles of administration to secure obedience

from the individual will. The code appears among ancient peoples as soon as they emerge from savage life. Moreover, the clearer, the less cumbersome, the more accurately defined, the principles of law are, the more closely will society be knit together, and fulfill the purposes of good government.

The same fact holds good everywhere. No body of men ever unite in the pursuit of a common object without defining the purposes for which they form the association, and the laws by which they shall be controlled. The large corporation or the simple partnership of two men engaged in trade; the charter of a great city or the incorporation of a village alike have the terms and objects of their association drawn up in regular form. In each of the several cases, what the Twelve Tables or the Code, the Magna Charta or the Constitution, the Articles of Agreement or the Terms of Partnership, are for the purposes of civil government or business in temporal affairs, even so is the Creed to the people of God in spiritual things.

The necessity of one may be discovered unmistakably by the evils which attend its absence. No professed Christians have ever declaimed more loudly against creeds than the disciples of Alexander Campbell. They have held that the New Testament is creed enough for them; and that there is no need of systematizing its truths as a guide to believers. But the consequences of this polity, as admitted with grief by the founder of this sect, were that straightway, "There were all sorts of preaching by all sorts of men." So the Unitarian Church finds a like difficulty from the adoption of a creed which is so loose in its terms that it has practically no binding force. For, though this denomination is more generally cultured and intelligent than any other of equal size, yet despite the fact that they admit to fellowship almost every shade of opinion, they do not increase in numbers, and make no progress in winning the world to Christianity. Their liberty itself seems fatal to their existence; and their most devoted adherents lament the looseness of that "rope of sand" by which they are held together. They clearly foresee and admit that

their denomination must come to naught unless they shall succeed in defining more accurately their belief—as they say—but as other people can see at once, unless something more positive be fixed upon as a basis of belief. For it must be evident to every one who will observe closely that they have no cardinal doctrines which can give comfort to an inquirer, or be seized upon as rallying points and watchwords for aggressive movement. The consequence is that the more earnest souls, who require sincere spiritual nourishment, are driven by their own earnestness to orthodoxy; while those of the opposite character fall by their own natural gravity into infidelity. We conclude then from the relations of men in any society, whether formed for temporal or spiritual purposes, that a creed is found to be a necessity; and this truth is corroborated fully by the experience of those who try to dispense with it.

ACCEPTANCE OF A CREED.

Assuming that a creed is a necessity to a Church, the obligations of those who have accepted it, and promised obedience to its requirements as conditions of membership and holding office in it, are next to be considered.

The Church of Jesus Christ is a voluntary association. Perfect freedom of belief and action are indispensable to an intelligent religious life. No man can be forced to believe that which his conscience and judgment disapprove, and if he could there would be no virtue in the act. Neither can any one be seduced by trickery to give adherence to a formula of doctrine, whose signification he does not know because he can neither assent to nor reject that which he does not comprehend. Should any one plead that he has been deceived into accepting a confession of faith, as an extenuation for his act in rejecting the same, this would dishonor his intelligence so much that his conduct would have no significance or influence. The Form of Sound Words drawn from an Infallible Scripture stands at the threshold of Church membership. It is expressed in terse, simple language suited to any capacity, and invites the closest scrutiny. Its expounders are stationed expressly

to give every needed explanation; and these when in the line of duty, bid all to stand aloof until they can fully comprehend and cordially approve the essential doctrines of the Church they represent.

The catechumen owes it to himself to master clearly every part of the doctrinal basis on which his faith is to rest; and cannot, therefore, unless false to his conscience, promise obedience to that which his reason does not grasp. It is not meant that he fathom all the mysteries of faith, but that he apprehend the import of the words in their common acceptation. Duty to himself imperatively demands this much before he becomes a member of the religious corporation, that he should accept its creed fully, that he assent *ex animo*, and not *pro forma*. If he has any doubts he is self-condemned; if he accepts that which he does not cordially believe, he is false. For it should be borne in mind that this is an intensely personal act by which a man promises adherence to a formula of faith. Upon himself alone the obligation primarily rests to be clear in his understanding of the terms of admission, and sincere in their full acceptation. His duties in this respect are both absolute and relative: absolute, in the significance which the creed has to his spiritual life; relative, in the attitude into which it brings him to the individual members of the church which he joins and the body at large.

But these are duties resting solely on himself, which can be delegated to no other, and for which he is solely responsible. And before he can become a member of the religious body, though he be already satisfied in his intellect and conscience, he is required to promise most solemnly to study the peace, the prosperity and the good fame of the church to which he seeks admission. Even if he make no verbal or written promise, still there would be a tacit understanding fully involving all this. For no church would accept a member coming with the intention to create scandal, disorder or schism; and the applicant knowing this would be false and treacherous if he entered for such purpose, though nothing were said on this subject. But,

to the tacit agreement, there is added the most binding promise which it is possible for any man to give. This obligation is unlimited in its extent within the obvious meaning of the creed, and can be weakened by no mental reservation, for this would be lying to the Holy Spirit; neither can it be by any expressed dissent, for this would insure his rejection by that body he seeks to enter.

PECULIAR OBLIGATIONS OF THE MINISTRY AND TEACHERS OF THE CHURCH.

The foregoing may all be predicated of the ordinary private believer who seeks membership in a church. How much more then is the obligation increased in the case of one who aspires to be an expounder of the creed, and so to indoctrinate others into its requirements! Here let us consider the nature of these obligations a little more closely. The candidate seeks admission to the church, and asks to be allowed to subscribe to its confession of faith. The Church does not go to him and ask his assistance to enable her to settle her doctrines. He is not one of the original parties to the compact, and hence has nothing whatever to do in fixing the terms. If he, in company with others, formed a voluntary association *de novo* and for purposes which they were competent to control, and with them defined their principles of action, the case would be entirely different. They who have power to fix the terms of a voluntary association and therefore have the control of its entire policy, may change, modify or destroy their own work. But the terms of a creed are fixed by the words of Revelation. God speaks in the person of Jesus Christ, and teaches what His Church shall believe. The Church is not the creation of man, but of God. Its doctrines are determined for it. They may be systematized by the intellect of man; but only so far as they express the mind of the Spirit speaking through His word are they set forth or received as of binding force. And every man who honestly accepts a confession of faith does so in this sense. If he does so in any other, he is false to himself, to the Church and to the Redeemer.

Thus the Church and its formulæ are something which the applicant for admission finds already existing antecedent and independent of his application; and with which he has nothing to do so far as to settling the doctrine or polity. If he be admitted to membership the relative obligation to faithful adherence cannot be terminated at will while he continues in the communion; and so can never cease unless the society be disbanded and all its members renounce their creed. Even in case all the others died, his absolute obligation would still be valid. And if all the rest apostatized, their unfaithfulness would not absolve him as an honest man from his allegiance. His attitude in subscribing to the formulæ, as we have seen, is purely voluntary; yet after this act he has no alternative but obedience. For if he can throw off his allegiance this must be because it was wrong to assume it; and the offense rests with himself, not with the body, which he of his own motion joined.

WHAT COMMON HONESTY REQUIRES.

It is not meant that a man is compelled to believe precisely the same doctrines all the time. He may discover by subsequent growth in spiritual things that he once assented to views which he is now confident were erroneous. But he cannot justly take advantage of this change of views to injure that body whose doctrines he has been solemnly set apart to teach and by whose consecrated funds he is supported—at least, while he is still in his office. There are three considerations which must be weighed most carefully by that man who has promised allegiance to a creed, and finds himself afterwards undergoing a change of belief.

1. Until his mind is fully satisfied that his previous position was wrong, he is bound in duty to his brethren as well as to himself, not to teach anything contrary to the accepted faith.

2. After he is convinced that his former views were erroneous, he cannot assail them from the vantage ground of official position in that church he has now virtually abandoned and condemned.

3. When he feels compelled to quit that communion which he voluntarily sought, and whose peace and prosperity he promised before God to study, he is under the most solemn obligations to go out in such a way as to do the least possible harm to that body he forsakes.

SOME CAUSES FOR CHANGE OF OPINION.

Under the first item it is pertinent to observe, that if a man has had a clear and full apprehension of the doctrines he embraces, if he has given them that degree of solemn thought which their acceptation demands as being the most important act which the immortal soul can perform, there is no great likelihood that he will ever, unless he makes a shipwreck of faith, depart very far from them. For if light be sought from above, if the momentous truths of religion as they are set forth in the precise language of a creed be weighed with due care, then they are accepted because they meet the true wants of the soul; and since these wants are always the same, therefore a radical change in doctrine is not reasonable. Such a change throws discredit on the whole life of a man, unless, as in the case of Paul, his eyes be opened by a miracle. Cardinal Newman was undoubtedly wrong before his great change of views, or after—most probably both! The case is entirely different when, as in the Catholic Church, the people are kept in profound ignorance of the truth of that revelation which is their professed guide. For by the trickery of a corrupt priesthood, traditions have been made to eclipse the true light of the Gospel. The changes here are really from heathenism to Christianity—there is not a change of doctrine so much as the formation, for the first time of an intelligent and responsible belief. It augurs a frivolous mind, or apostacy from the true faith, much oftener than an honest change proceeding from true enlightenment of the Spirit, when a man who has had the culture and opportunities necessary to enable him to arrive at an intelligent faith, throws away his matured convictions for something radically different.

Doubt is often highly commended as the expression of honest

independence; but this proceeds from an erroneous view of the nature of Revelation. For as this was confessedly given by an All-wise Being, to meet the necessities of His creatures, it is adapted to its purpose completely. The consciousness of inability within is met by the assurance of help from without. The way to the aid afforded is so plain that the wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein, and he that runs may read the terms of the Gospel offer. Hence doubt does not proceed from genuine perplexity so much as from an unwillingness to endure the care necessary to arrive at clear conceptions, or refusal to submit to the truth when it crosses our inclinations. The reason is convinced but the heart is hostile. It is no mark of superior wisdom or sanctity that a man should be always uncertain about his belief; or that he from time to time declares his former convictions were worthless!

All Christians, it is true, may have many doubts; but the honest ones are nearly always subjective. The fear of the faithful teacher is—"lest after having preached the Gospel to others he himself become a castaway." It is the most difficult of all things for a genuine inquirer to believe that he, with all his shortcomings, can be saved. Such doubt may lead to temporary darkness, and the soul may be well nigh in despair; but this true Christian experience is farthest removed from a hypercritical spirit, and never led any believer to question the grounds of faith as a foundation on which other men should trust. But heretical doubts arise from the desire to escape from the teachings of Revelation rather than uncertainty about what they really are. Hence, when the unstable man cuts loose from the safe moorings of a fixed faith he measures the articles of the creed by his own desires, and rejects all that will not conform to the standard. The Gospel has become too strong meat, and must be toned down to suit weak digestion. The medicine for sin is quite too bitter as it comes from the pharmacy of Revelation, and must be sugar-coated by human reason. The sick man in his delirium must be allowed to prescribe his own remedy. Or, perchance, the old-fashioned doc-

trines are too simple and must be wrapped up in a cloud of speculation. The popular minister or professor has itching ears in his charge which must be tickled, and hence he must say "some new thing," to gratify his cultivated Atheniana. Such are the reasons which often influence those who prove recreant to their vows of obedience to Church dogmas, and waste the Lord's heritage by division.

DOUBTS AFTER THE ADOPTION OF A CREED.

Notwithstanding the frequent and flagrant dishonesty of those who reject a creed they once professed, let us admit the case where honest doubts do arise in the mind of a man who has promised to teach the doctrines of the Church. What is his duty as a high-toned Christian under these circumstances? Before he accepted these doctrines, and especially ere he solemnly promised to teach them, he was bound by every consideration of faithfulness to God, to the Church, and to himself, to understand what he embraced. If he gave the doctrines that attention which their importance deserves, he surely cannot lightly reject and endeavor to destroy them. If he is now convinced that he was formerly in error, this should make him still more careful lest he commit the fault over again. For the rejection of one doctrine does not disprove this, nor make its opposite true; and the previous error of judgment renders the probability much greater that the second belief will be wrong. Besides, he should rather feel humiliated at the posture in which his failure in discovering the truth formerly has placed him, than exultant at his new departure. While the process of change is going on in any church member, and especially a public teacher, he is constrained by every consideration of duty which can influence an honest mind not to teach views which are in a transition state; and not to cast doubt over the minds of others upon points about which he is not certain yet that they are erroneous. For, as his appointed duty was to teach these things and nothing else, he surely cannot reject them himself, and advise others to do the same, until he is cer-

tain of their falsity—a certainty which must be arrived at through the humiliating remembrance that these views were once accepted after an examination which called into play the best powers of his nature. But this is the time precisely when embryo heretics are most noisy. They take especial delight in unsettling the minds of others in order to awaken sympathy by their doubts. Having no safe ground on which to stand, they find congenial work in undermining all the foundations upon which earnest souls have anchored their hopes.

WHAT HONOR DEMANDS.

It is clear that no man can in honor teach views opposed to what he has vowed to maintain so long as he remains voluntarily connected with the body of which this is the creed. If he does this he is false to every trust; a traitor in the camp whose conduct is scandalous though his views were right. What, then, is he to do while in this chrysalis state? Clearly he cannot teach his present views without being traitorous to his brethren, neither can he teach his former belief without being false to himself. It may be said that this would compel a man to be silent, perhaps for a long time. This is assuredly the course he should voluntarily take, since with him rested the responsibility of settling his convictions before he entered on his work. Besides, it would be the best thing for the world that a man who does not know his own mind should preserve everlasting silence!

As he had no right in the first place to teach others until his own faith was well grounded, *a fortiori* he cannot now when it has become unsettled. For, before he united with any body of Christians his views affected only himself, because he spoke by no authority. Yet surely until he believed something he should not attempt to indoctrinate others into his crude notions. Now, the obligation is infinitely stronger for him to keep silence because of the injury he may do. For he is clothed with the authority which an official position gives him; and if from this vantage ground, he, as a traitor, assaults those who remain loyal

to the truth as they understand it, he surely has reached the lowest scale of dishonor and vileness. Silence then is the only true and honorable policy which can be adopted by that man who has become unsettled in his faith after he has accepted and vowed to teach the formularies of a Church; and this must continue as long, at least, as he remains within the pale of that denomination.

Moreover, he cannot during this period, rightfully enjoy those advantages which accrue from his official position. For if he be honored and compensated in virtue of his services in a certain line of work, when he ceases to do this, his right to reward ceases. Surely this is no more than common honesty. But what is the unvarying course of false teachers? Witness the actions of Strauss, Renan, the Newmans, Colenso—the list might be extended to our own country and to living examples—who exacted payment for a specific work after it had become notorious that they were doing their utmost for its overthrow! Yet that man who in his conscience must know that he has drifted from his former anchorage, that he is laying waste those very doctrines which he vowed to God to support, has no compunctions, has no sense of shame, to compel him to renounce his position and surrender its emoluments!

WITHDRAWAL A NECESSITY.

A conscious change of views should be followed by a voluntary withdrawal from the Church which holds them. After a man has changed his belief and become fully settled in his new doctrine, there is but one course for him to take; he must not wait for his brethren to advise or compel him to go; he must take the initiative in leaving that body whose outward badge consists in those doctrines which he has rejected. He cannot remain and teach his present views, for that would be treason. He cannot remain there in silence even, because his presence is a tacit acknowledgement of adherence to the views of his brethren. His place is outside; and as he came in voluntarily, he should go out solely of his own movement. He must not wait the

inquisition of his brethren whether he be of them or not, to determine his position, since he knows that already. For it is his business to know where he stands, and to act upon that determination—an act which he can delegate to no one besides. He came in to be benefited and to benefit in turn. He vowed to study the peace of the Church which he entered; and as that vow can now be fulfilled only by his departure, this is his clear and imperative duty.

Still more. For the sake of that peace he must go out with as little stir as possible, and with no effort to carry a following with him. For, as he took no one in but himself when he entered, and as he taught no others subsequently, if true to his vows, by advocating any other doctrines than those of this body, he can of right take none with him. If by teaching heresy to this Church he has introduced those who are hostile to its doctrines, the wrong is equally great, whether he agitates the body by taking them with him, or let them remain to vex the brethren. For this wrong might have been obviated by his silence, self-imposed, as soon as his views were known by him to diverge from the faith of the communion. But now he has wrought an injury which cannot be fully repaired; and can be palliated only by his unconditional departure. Such a necessity should cause the occasion of it the deepest mortification, and make him walk softly while leaving the house where he has repaid the hospitality enjoyed by irreparable injury. *On the contrary the audacity of the heretic and the confidence in his new departure, are increased by the number of times his former convictions have been found by himself to be false!* Indeed, would it not be a new thing under the sun for a self-appointed reformer to take such a course as has been recommended? It would seem strange, not because it is contradictory to common honesty, but because it is the opposite of that course taken by those who disturb the peace of the Church by their heretical teaching.

DISASTER THE INVARIABLE OUTCOME OF HERESY.

The essential nature of heresy can be, in every case, illustrated by its effects. For a time the martyr who has been excommunicated is the idol of a few who cling to him because of personal friendship; of those who are attracted by his learning and eloquence; or, more than all, follow him because they hate what they term uncharitable orthodoxy. But such adventurers in a short time come to nothing; and their followers, like sheep without a shepherd, are left in the wilderness. Possibly personal qualities may attach his admirers until the end of life; but when their apostle dies, as he was not commissioned of Christ he has no successors. But generally the end comes sooner. Relieved from all the salutary restraints thrown around him by associating with such as hold the truth, embittered by fancied wrongs, or puffed up by the idea of becoming a great reformer, the wandering star recedes farther and farther from the sun, until at last he is lost in the night of hopeless unbelief.

II.

SCHOLASTIC AND MYSTIC THEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

LITERATURE ON SCHOLASTICISM.

I. *Sources.*—The works of ANSELM, ABELARD, PETER THE LOMBARD, ALBERTUS M., THOMAS AQUINAS, DUNS SCOTUS, OCCAM, BONAVENTURA, and other Schoolmen.

II. *Works.*—DEAN D. HAMPDEN (Bishop of Hereford, d. 1868): *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology.* (Bampton Lectures.) Oxford, 1832; 3rd ed., 1838.

BARTH. HAURÉAU: *De la Philosophie scholastique.* Paris, 1850, 2 vols.

H. KAULICH: *Geschichte der scholastischen Philosophie.* Prag, 1863.

*C. PRANTL: *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande.* Leipzig, 1861–'70, 4 vols.

F. D. MAURICE (d. 1872): *Mediæval Philosophy.* London, 1870.

*ALBERT STÖCKL (Rom. Cath. Prof. of Philosophy at Münster): *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters.* Mainz, 1864–'66, 3 vols. The first volume covers the beginning of Scholasticism (Isidor of Seville, Bede, Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, Paschasius Radbertus, Gottschalk, Scotus Erigena, Anselm, Abelard, Gilbert de la Poirrée, Bernard of Clairvaux, the two Victors, Peter the Lombard, John of Salisbury); the second, the period of its supremacy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; the third, the period of opposition and decline down to Jesuitism and Jansenism. Strongly anti-Protestant.

*H. REUTER (Prof. of Church History in Göttingen, d. 1889): *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter.* Berlin, 1875–'77, 2 vols. Important for the skeptical and rationalistic tendencies of the Middle Ages.

*TH. HARPER: *The Metaphysics of the School.* London, 1880 sq.

KARL WERNER (Rom. Cath.): *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters.* Wien, 1881–'87, 4 vols. (Vol. I., on Duns Scotus; II., the post-Scotist Scholasticism; III. and IV., the Last Stages of Scholasticism.)

F. L. HETTINGER (R. Cath.): *De Theologiæ speculativæ ac mysticæ connubio.* Würzburg, 1882.

FR. EHRLE (S. J.): *Beiträge zur Gesch. der mittelalterlichen Scholastik,* in "Archiv für Lit.—und Kirchengesch. des Mittelalters," Bd. I. 365 sqq. (1885), and Bd. V. 603 sqq. (1889).

III. The relevant chapters in the Doctrine Histories of NEANDER, GIESELER

BAUR, HAGENBACH, THOMASIUS, HARNACK, and those of Roman Catholic divines, BACH (*Dogmengesch. des Mittelalters*, 1873–'75, 2 vols.) and SCHWANE (*Dogmengesch. der mittleren Zeit*, 1882). FRIEDRICH NITZSCH: Art. "Scholastische Theol." in Herzog.² XIII. 650–675.

IV. The Histories of Philosophy by H. RITTER, UEBERWEG (who gives also the literature, 7th ed. by Heinze, 1883; see English translation by Morris I. 355 sqq.), and ERDMANN (Hough's Engl. trsl., London, 1890, Vol. I. 287–543).

NATURE AND AIM OF SCHOLASTICISM.

SCHOLASTICISM, that is the theology of the School, is the ruling theology of the Middle Ages, and retains in modified form its ascendancy in the Roman Church.[1] The ancient Church produced Fathers; the mediæval Church, Doctors or Teachers; the modern Church, Reformers. The Fathers worked in the quarries of the Scriptures, and brought out the dogmas, one by one, in conflict with heresy. The Schoolmen collected, analyzed and systematized the dogmas, and proved their reasonableness against the skeptical objections of reason. The Fathers furnished the material; the Schoolmen constructed the building.

Every religion that has a theology at all has also a scholastic theology. A period of creation is followed by a period of preservation. Judaism produced rabbinical and talmudic theology; Catholicism has its mediæval scholasticism; Protestantism has a Lutheran and a Calvinistic scholasticism. The first is based on the Mosaic law and the tradition of the Elders; the second, on the Bible and the Fathers; the third, on the Bible and the Reformers. All these forms of scholasticism are attempts to formulate and define by logic and to comprehend by the understanding the facts of revelation and the tenets of faith. New ideas are systematized, analyzed, defined, fenced in, and defended against objections.

In this logical and dialectical process they lose their original freshness and freedom. The living body of divinity, the *corpus doctrinæ*, becomes at last a corpse of divinity, and is buried.

[1] Pope Leo XIII., in an Encyclical of Aug. 4, 1879, earnestly recommended the study of the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, as the standard of Catholic orthodoxy.

But this is not necessary. The greatest Schoolmen, as Anselm and Thomas, were conscious of the inexhaustible depth of divine truth, which transcends the powers of logic. They combined, like Augustin, a mystic element with the scholastic, meditation and prayer with speculation, and their discussions are heated by the sacred fire of devotion. Hence they still live and will live to the end of time.

Mediæval Scholasticism made noble efforts to reconcile revelation and reason, faith and philosophy. Anselm gave a few splendid specimens, proving the existence of God and the necessity of the incarnation. Peter the Lombard and his commentators covered the whole ground and worked all the dogmas into a coherent system of knowledge illuminating every nook and corner, and answering every question concerning the mysteries of faith. They started from the Augustinian principle that "faith precedes knowledge."[1] They quoted, as a biblical proof-text, Isa. 7: 9: "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established."[2] With this they connected the other principle, that faith necessarily leads to knowledge. Abelard reversed the order, and made knowledge precede faith; but he arrived at the same result. Revelation and reason, faith and knowledge, theology and philosophy, agree in principle and conclusion; for they proceed from the same God who cannot contradict Himself. Scotus Erigena had anticipated this position in the ninth century, and speculative theologians and Christian philosophers of modern times accept it.

But there are different conceptions of faith and of philosophy. The scholastic divines stood on the ground of the traditional faith of the Fathers and the Councils. In the firm conviction of the truth and reasonableness of the orthodox faith,

[1] "*Fides præcedit intellectum*," or as Anselm expressed it: "*Credo ut intelligam, non intelligo ut credam.*"

[2] According to the rendering of the Vulgate: "*Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis.*" The proper translation is: "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established," or, to come nearer to the Hebrew assonance: "Be firm in faith, or ye will not be made firm in fact."

they ventured on the boldest speculations, raised and answered all sorts of doubts which formerly were urged by heretics from without, and ran every dogma through a fiery ordeal to show its invulnerable nature. They were the knights of theology who fought with the weapons of logic and dialectics all the real and imaginary enemies of the Church. As there were Godfreys and Tancreds, so there were also Don Quixotes and Sancho Panzas among the knights of the scholastic tournaments.

The scholastic systems furnish a parallel to the contemporary papal hierarchy and Gothic architecture. The papacy subjected all temporal kingdoms to its divine authority; architecture made all arts tributary to worship; scholastic theology ruled philosophy as a mere handmaid, and used all available knowledge for the vindication of the orthodox faith. We must admire those lofty cathedrals of thought, which rise higher and higher till they seem to float in the air, and which reflect through their painted windows the sublime mysteries of religion. They solved the highest problems of speculation to the satisfaction of their age.

DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLASTICISM.

Scholastic theology began with Anselm, reached its height in Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, and began to decline with Occam, and died of old age before the Reformation. One of its last representatives was Cardinal Cajetan, the commentator of Thomas Aquinas, who as papal delegate met Luther at Augsburg in 1518, and, after vainly disputing with him, said of the German monk: "*Habet profundos oculos et mirabiles speculationes in capite suo.*"

Scholasticism achieved its greatest work in the thirteenth century, but degenerated during the fourteenth into barren formalism, and lost itself in the labyrinth of empty speculations. By analyzing, dividing, sub-dividing the articles of faith, those subtle dialecticians squeezed the very life out of them. Instead of studying the Bible and discussing topics of practical importance, they busied themselves with such idle

questions of curiosity as, how many angels could dance at the same instant on the point of a needle; or, what possible effect the sacrament of the altar may have upon a mouse. Some answered that the consecrated elements would sanctify the mouse; others, that they would kill it; still others, more wisely because less foolishly, that they would have no effect at all, since they could be partaken of only by an animal *accidentaliter*, not *sacramentaliter*.

The papacy lost its power by its towering ambition; the crusades failed in gaining the permament possession of the Holy Land; the noblest Gothic cathedrals remained unfinished; Scholasticism, by the abuse of speculation, dug its own grave, and was conquered by biblical theology. The mediæval knight disappeared with the invention of gunpowder; the scholastic philosopher, with the discoveries of science and the progress of free thought.

Scholasticism cultivated only dogmatic and ethic, theology and the canon law. It made no original contributions to exegesis and church history. The Bible was constantly used, indeed, but chiefly as a repository of proof texts with the help of the *Catenæ Patrum*, or compilations of patristic comments. Church history was identified with the authoritative tradition of the Church, which included such fables as the Donation of Constantine and such forgeries as the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

THE SOURCES OF SCHOLASTICISM. AUGUSTIN AND ARISTOTLE.

The fathers and feeders of mediæval Scholasticism were St. Augustin and Aristotle. The former furnished the matter; the latter, the form. The religious ideas of the African divine were fortified by the logical and dialectical method of the Greek philosopher. The decrees and canons of Synods and the *Decretum* of Gratian were also used as authorities in addition to the sentences of the Fathers.

Augustin was, next to the inspired writers, the greatest theological authority both for Schoolmen and Mystics, as afterwards for the Reformers of the sixteenth century. He has been

called "the oracle of thirteen centuries." He impressed his mind upon every page in the history of Christian thought. But it was mainly the Catholic, churchly, sacramentarian, anti-Manichæan and anti-Donatist Augustin who ruled the Middle Ages; while the evangelical or anti-Pelagian Augustin was not properly appreciated before Luther and Calvin, who adopted and reproduced his doctrines of sin and grace. How strange that the same mighty intellect who helped to rear the imposing structure of Scholasticism should have aided the Reformers in pulling it down!

The heathen Aristotle was the greatest philosophical authority of the Schoolmen. He was, in the estimation of the Middle Ages, the master-thinker, as Virgil was the master-poet. As the noblest of the heathen, both were mercifully assigned a place in the outer court of the Church. Dante consistently excludes them from Paradise and Purgatory, and places them in the vestibule of the Inferno, but without actual suffering, and Virgil accompanies him to the very threshold of Paradise. The Schoolmen revered Aristotle as a Moses or John the Baptist in the intellectual field, as a forerunner of the truth which came with Christ. His logical formulas or scheme of reasoning, his dialectical acuteness, the fertility and general applicability of his method seemed to them to be the only or the surest way to the knowledge and defense of the truth.

Aristotle's Greek writings were not accessible to Christian Europe till after the downfall of Constantinople, and, with the exception of John Scotus Erigena, the Schoolmen were almost wholly ignorant of Greek. He was known, however, from extracts by Cassiodorus and Boëthius (d. 524), and from Latin translations of Arabic versions and commentaries of Mohammedan scholars in Asia (Bagdad) and Spain (Cordova), as Avicenna (980–1036), Ghazalis or Algazel (1059–1111), Averrhoës (1126–1198). The Spanish Jews also cultivated the study of Aristotle and of the Neo-Platonists, and influenced Christian scholasticism, especially Moses Maimonides (1135–1204).[1]

[1] On the Moslem and Jewish philosophers, see Ueberweg, I. 402–428.

At first the study of Aristotle was looked upon with suspicion, and was even temporarily prohibited by popes and synods, as breeding heresy and intellectual pride. Simon de Tourney, a zealous champion of Aristotelian philosophy, was misled by conceit into blasphemy, and became dumb and childish.[1] But from the beginning of the thirteenth century, when the greatest Schoolmen made use of the Stagirite for the defense of the doctrines of the Church, his authority continued unabated to the period of the Reformation, when for a time it was shaken to its base.

Luther denounced in unmeasured terms "the damned heathen Aristotle," as he called him in a fit of wrath against the degenerate Schoolmen of his day. Melanchthon, with all his superior knowledge and admiration of Greek literature, at first banished philosophy altogether from Christian theology. But in his maturer writings, especially in his Ethic, he availed himself of the aid of Aristotelian and scholastic logic and dialectic. Luther himself, in defending his ubiquitarian theory of the Eucharist, resorted to the scholastic distinctions of various kinds of presence; and the Lutheran and Calvinistic divines of the seventeenth century reduce the doctrines of the Reformation to a scholastic system.

NOMINALISM AND REALISM.

F. Exner: *Ueber Nominalismus und Realismus.* Prague, 1842.

H. O. Köhler: *Realismus und Nominalismus in ihrem Einfluss auf die dogmatischen Systeme des Mittelalters.* Gotha, 1858.

Hermann Doergens: *Zur Lehre von den Universalien.* Heidelberg, 1867.

Prantl: *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande.* Vol. II. Leipzig, 3rd ed., 1867.

J. H. Löwe: *Der Kampf zwischen dem Realismus und Nominalismus im Mittelalter.* Prague, 1876.

Comp. Neander, IV. 359 sqq. (Am. ed.); Ullmann: *Reformatoren vor der Reformation,* II. 327 sqq.; Ueberweg: *History of Philosophy,* I. 367–377

[1] After a brilliant defense of the dogma of the Trinity, he said: "*O Jesule, Jesule, quantum in hac questione confirmavi legem tuam et exaltavi. Profecto si malignando et adversando vellem, fortioribus rationibus et argumentis scirem illam infirmare et deprimendo improbare.*"

(trsl. of Morris); and an appendix to *Bain's Mental and Moral Science* (London, 1868).

At the root of all scholastic speculations lay the problem of the relation between subjective thought and objective existence, between the conception of a thing and the thing itself. More particularly, it was the question concerning the nature of the general or generic conceptions, called *universalia*, such as man, animal, tree, in distinction from particular men, animals, trees.[1]

On this question the Schoolmen were divided into two contending camps,—REALISTS and NOMINALISTS.

The Realists taught that the *universalia* exist really or in fact as well as in the mind. They were subdivided into two classes: the Platonic Realists contended that the *universalia* are *ante rem*, that is, the creative types of individual things in the divine mind; the Aristotelian Realists held that the *universalia* are *in re*, that is, the general substance of particular existences. Socrates is a man, partaking of the general human nature, and is at the same time an individual, distinct from all other men. The second kind of realism is also called *formalism*, as it conceives of the ideas as the primitive forms (*formæ nativæ*) of things.[2]

The Nominalists maintained that the general conceptions have no objective existence and are mere names (*nomina, flatus vocis*), or abstractions from concrete, individual beings and things (*universalia post rem*). Some, however, allowed them an ideal and necessary subjective existence in the mind.

[1] Sometimes the term *universalia* was applied to the five general conceptions of the Aristotelian logic, the so-called *prædicabilia*, γένος, εἶδος, διαφορά, ἴδιον, συμβεβηκός, or *genus, species, differentia, proprium, accidens*. The controversy seems to have started in a passage from the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, known to the contestants only in the translations of Boëthius. Porphyry raises the question whether the *universalia* are realities, or mere words, but declines to enter into a discussion.

[2] Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth century (*Opus majus*, P. I., c. 6, f. 28), states the different theories thus: "*Aliqui ponunt ea* (*universalia*) *solum in anima, aliqui extra, aliqui medio modo.*"

The philosophical controversy assumed practical importance when it was applied to theology, especially to the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and to the doctrine of original sin.

Realism was the prevailing theory till the close of the eleventh century, when Roscellin, a canon at Compiègne,[1] and founder of a school of dialectics, proclaimed the theory of Nominalism in its extreme form. From a letter of Abelard, a pupil though not a disciple, of Roscellin, to the Bishop of Paris, we learn that he even denied the reality of the distinction of parts in an object, declaring them to be merely subjective and verbal. In his application of the nominalist principle to the dogma of the Trinity, he could not avoid falling into open tritheism. Regarding the idea of Deity (divine nature, divine essence), like all general conceptions, as a mere abstraction of the understanding, he ascribed objective existence only to the three Persons, and made them three beings equal in will and power, like three angels or three men.[2] If the general divine essence were a real existence, it would follow that not only the Son, but the Father and the Holy Spirit also became incarnate. Nominalism could not admit two natures in Christ without dividing Him into two persons. It was opposed to the Augustinian theory of a race-sin in Adam's fall, and of a race redemption, distinct from individual redemption. But these consequences were not all drawn.

In opposition to the tritheistic Nominalism of Roscellin, Anselm of Canterbury defended Realism and the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.[3] He charged against Roscellin, that he could not rise above the sensual and empirical; that he made all true knowledge impossible, and had no room for an incarnation or a union of the divine nature with the human nature, since he acknowledged only divine and human persons.

The tritheism of Roscellin was condemned by a Council of

[1] Roscellinus, also Rucelinus de Compendio.

[2] "*Tres res per se, sicut tres angeli aut tres animæ.*"

[3] *De Fide Trinitatis et de Incarnatione Verbi contra blasphemias Rucelini* (written 1094).

Soissons under the lead of the Archbishop of Rheims (1093). He retired from public sight.

This action was fatal to Nominalism for a long time. Realism in its various forms prevailed down to the fourteenth century. Anselm represented the Platonic realism of the *universalia ante rem;* Duns Scotus and the later Realists adopted the Aristotelian theory of the *universalia in re.*

Nominalism was revived by William Occam (d. 1347) in concealed connection with a skeptical and Protestant turn of mind. Occam, called the *venerabilis inceptor*, taught that the *universale* or generic idea is nothing real, either in or outside of the mind, but has only an imaginary existence. He sided with Louis of Bavaria against the Pope, and opposed various abuses in the Church. He professed, it is true, absolute submission to the orthodox creed, but so repeatedly and emphatically, that his sincerity has been questioned; he may have done so to enforce his opposition to the hierarchy.

Repeated attempts were made to put down Nominalism, as a dangerous innovation, and Louis XI. even threatened the Nominalists with perpetual banishment, but in vain; he had to recall his edict (1481). Nominalism was embraced by the Schoolmen of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, D'Ailly, Gerson, Buridanus, Marsilius of Inghen, by the forerunners of the Reformation (with the exception of Wiclif, Hus and Jerome of Prague, who were Realists), and by the Reformers themselves, as far as they took part in scholastic questions.

The prevalence of Nominalism was one of the silent forces which encouraged criticism and innovation, and undermined faith in the traditional orthodoxy and in scholasticism itself, as a philosophic defense of the catholic faith. It indirectly promoted also empirical and natural sciences by laying stress on experience as a foundation of knowledge.

Under this aspect Alexander von Humboldt assigns to Nominalism a place in the development of physical science. But he speaks highly also of earlier Schoolmen, especially Albert the Great and Roger Bacon, who comprehended all the learning

of the thirteenth century and had a deep insight into some mysteries of nature. The study of Aristotelian philosophy promoted the empirical study of nature, as may be seen from the Arabic scholars of the Middle Ages. Humboldt connects even the discovery of America with the scholastic speculations of the thirteenth century.[1]

MYSTICISM AND SCHOLASTICISM.

LITERATURE.

G. Arnold: *Historie und Beschreibung der mystischen Theologie.* Frankf., 1703.

Berger: *Disputatio de mysticismo.* Harlem, 1819.

H. Schmid: *Der Mysticismus des Mittelalters, in seiner Entstehungsperiode dargestellt.* Jena, 1824.

Tholuck: *Blüthensammlung aus der morgenländischen Mystik.* Berlin, 1825. (327 pp.) See Witte, *Leben Tholuck's*, I. 360–369.

Heinroth: *Geschichte und Kritik des Mysticismus aller bekannten Völker und Zeiten.* 1830.

Höfling: *Der wahrhaft historische Mysticismus.* Erlangen, 1832.

Theremin: *Ueber das Wesen der mystischen Theologie.* In the "Abendstunden," Berlin, 1833.

Ferd. Chr. Baur: *Die Christl. Gnosis in ihrer geschichtl. Entwickelung.* Tübingen, 1835.

J. Görres (Prof. of History in Munich, founder of German ultramontanism, d. 1848): *Die Christliche Mystik.* Regensb., 1836–'42, 4 vols. (Vol. IV. in 2 parts). An intensely mystical book; a product of genius and fancy rather than of sober, historical investigation.

Charles Schmidt: *Essai sur les mystiques du 14 siècle, précédé d' une introduction sur l' origine et la nature du mysticisme.* Strassb., 1836.

A. Helfferich: *Die Christl. Mystik in ihrer Entwickelung und in ihren Denkmalen.* Gotha, 1842, 2 parts.

Frz. Pfeiffer: *Deutsche Mystiker des 14 Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig, 1845–'57, 2 vols.

Noack: *Die Christl. Mystik nach ihrem geschichtl. Entwickelungsgang.* Königsberg, 1863, 2 parts,

Böhringer: *Die Deutschen Mystiker des 14 und 15ten Jahrh.* Zurich, 1855.

R. A. Vaughan: *Hours with the Mystics.* London, 1856; 3rd ed., 1880, 2 vols.

J. Hamberger: *Stimmen der Mystik aus dem Heiligtum der Christl. Mystik und Theosophie.* Stuttgart, 1857, 2 parts.

M. Jocham: *Lichtstrahlen aus den Schriften katholischer Mystik.* München, 1876 sq.

[1] *Kosmos*, Vol. II., 282 sq. (German ed.).

H. S. Denifle (R. Cath.): *Das geistl. Leben. Eine Blumenlese aus den deutschen Mystikern und Gottesfreunden des 14 Jahrh.* Graz, 3rd ed., 1880.
W. Preger (Oberconsistorialrath in Munich): *Geschichte der Deutschen Mystik, im Mittelalter.* Leipzig, 1874–'93. First Part, till Eckart; Second Part, till Suso; Third Part, Tauler, der Gottesfreund vom Oberlande, Merswin.
Carl du Prel: *Die Philosophie der Mystik.* Leipzig, 1885.

Mysticism or mystic theology aims at a direct communion with the infinite Spirit. It closes the outward eye, and seeks to see God with the inward eye and to enjoy Him face to face. Religion is based upon mystery, and God is the mystery of mysteries which transcends all thought, and yet unceasingly attracts the deepest thought. Hence almost every religion, the Jewish and Mohammedan as well as the Christian, has its mysticism. The Greek, the Latin, and the Protestant Churches have produced several schools of mystics,—sound and morbid, sober and extravagant, orthodox and heretical, churchly and separatistic. A distinction is sometimes made between mystic and mysticism, as also between scholastic and scholasticism.

Scholasticism and Mysticism are two different tendencies, which supplement or antagonize each other. As long as they keep within the limits of revealed truth, the difference between them is merely psychological. Paul and John represent the two distinct types in friendly relationship, and furnish inspiration to both schools of theology. The deepest thinkers approach each other on both lines. Augustin, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, had a mystic vein. Every Christian is a mystic as far as he bends reverently before the divine mysteries and longs for immediate union with God and Christ.

Scholastic theology may be called the theology of the intellect; mystic theology, the theology of feeling. The former proceeds from the head; the latter, from the heart. The one is logical and speculative; the other is contemplative and emotional. The Schoolman endeavors to attain the conception of God and divine things by reflection and the process of reasoning; the Mystic, by direct intuition and adoration. The one tends easily, though not necessarily, to rationalism; the other,

to pantheism.[1] The mystic divine shrinks from cold, dialectic speculation, deeming it to be a profanation of what is holy. Overleaping the boundaries of patient research, he hopes to grasp and enjoy the infinite by love and by prayer. God, says St. Bernard, is more easily and worthily sought and found by prayer than by disputation. God is known, says Hugo of St. Victor, so far only as He is loved. His disciple, Walter of St. Victor, calls Abelard, Peter the Lombard, Gilbert and Peter of Poitiers the four labyrinths of France, and protested that, under the inspiration of Aristotle, they had treated the ineffable mysteries of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation with scholastic levity. Dante puts a very high estimate on Thomas Aquinas as the master of scholastic theology, but places St. Bernard still higher, and is led by him through prayer to the beatific vision of the Holy Trinity, with which his "sacred poem" closes.

The mystic as well as the scholastic theologians appealed to St. Augustin, who combined the two; but in philosophy they parted entirely. As Scholasticism was wedded to Aristotle, Mysticism took for its guide Dionysius the Areopagite, a Christian Neo-Platonist of the fifth century, whose mystic writings were translated from the Greek by Scotus Erigena in the ninth century, and exerted a great influence throughout the Middle Ages upon scholastics as well as mystics, especially on Thomas Aquinas.[2]

[1] The tendency of scholasticism toward rationalism is very manifest in Abelard; but other speculative philosophers, like Scotus, Erigena, Spinoza, and Hegel were pantheists. The tendency of mysticism to pantheistic intoxication and absorption in the ocean of divine love shows itself in various forms in Master Eckard, Jacob Boehme, and is most daringly expressed by the famous hymnist, Scheffler,—popularly called Angelus Silesius (first a Lutheran, then a Jesuit, d. 1677), in his "Cherubinische Wandersmann," where he has the audacity to say:

> "*Gott ist so viel an mir, als mir an Ihm gelegen,*
> *Sein Wesen helf ich Ihm, wie Er das meine, hegen.*"

[2] See Schaff's *Church History*, IV., § 137, pp. 589–901. Corderius asserts that the "Angelic Doctor [Thomas Aquinas] drew almost the whole of his

The greatest scholastics had, as already remarked, combined the two tendencies, like Augustin. In Abelard and St. Bernard, scholastism and mysticism came into violent conflict; then they united again, or developed independently. When Scholasticism degenerated into barren speculation, Mysticism defended the inwardness and spirituality of religion, and prepared the way for the moral reformation of the Church.

There are different kinds and schools of Mysticism. Speculative mysticism or theosophy aims at the knowledge of the being of God. Emotional mysticism desires to enjoy the loveliness of God. Practical mysticism seeks a union with the will of God and the imitation of the life of Christ by conforming to His example. The last is the most useful, and is best represented by Tauler and Thomas à Kempis. All these forms may be churchly and orthodox, or unchurchly and heretical. "The Imitation of Christ" by Thomas à Kempis remains to this day the noblest monument of the sound, practical and devotional type of mediæval Mysticism.

theology out of the pseudo-Dionysian books, so that his *Summa* is but the hive in whose varied cells he duly stored the honey which he gathered from them." See Migne's ed. of Dionysius, I. 96.

III.

LAY WORK AND HOW TO SECURE IT.

BY REV. C. CLEVER, D.D.

EVERY thing conduces to make us realize, that the time has fully come, when every individual energy of Christendom must be girded for the battle that is upon us. The serious earnestness, of the practical and philosophical unbelief of these latter times, will not be laughed out of court. It must be met at all points by a counter earnestness on the part of the church, embodied in fiery activity in the service of God and man. Sons of men and sons of God, who count not life itself dear to win men for Christ, must be found upon every highway and along every hedge, if the broken fragments of society will crystalize around the cross of Christ. Only apostolic consecration and fair dealing with all, will give us any hope of success. At it all the time and with all the might will go far towards dislodging the enemy; but the rout will only be perfect when all are at it.

For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work. Mark 13: 34. The kingdom of heaven, again, is as a man travelling into a far country who gave to every man according to his several ability. Matthew 25: 15. Thus the King over all, whose right it is to rule all and receive service from all, left out of the fullness of His love, something for all His people to do. The sepulchres of divine human possibilities have had laid upon them great stones. It is for His people to roll them away, that the omnific power of Christ's resurgent glory shall be manifested, in regenerated

societies, which, being raised by Him, will come no more under the blasting power of greed and sin and selfishness. It can not be emphasized too frequently or too earnestly, that all the servants in the Kingdom were appointed to work. It was more than an apostolic recreation that prompted Paul to say to the Corinthians, "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit dividing to every man severally as He will."

The Church to His practiced eye is a bee hive of Christian activity where every man, woman and child has the widest opportunity for the eminent exercise of all the gifts of body, soul and spirit, sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Preachers and doctors, teachers and students, watchmen and laborers are all enlisted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, for the perfecting of the saints and the building up of the body of Christ.

In all this wide range of Christian activity, there will be differences of administration. But these differences dare not pre-empt any sphere, in such a way, as to close it against any who are capable of glorifying God, in the use of the capabilities with which He has providentially endowed them. In the family life, completion is only attained, when the humblest has brought his contribution of sympathy and helpfulness to make up the store-house of its glory. In like manner, in the royal family, whose head is in heaven, and who has knit all the members into one mystical union with Himself. It is being felt, on every hand, that there is a large portion of the Christian family which has not contributed its full share to the edifying of the body of Christ. In the possibilities of our lay activity, there is a sleeping giant, who can be awakened and who when

once girded with strength can steady a tottering ark, and prevent a temple from heedless desecration.

As soon as ever there is given an opportunity for laymen to render unhindered service, it is embraced with an alacrity that surprises the most expectant. Christian Endeavorers, Brotherhoods and Guilds, when properly started, find men following with a heroism and self sacrifice, surpassing the avidity with which the monastics of the middle ages gave up all for a religious seclusion. The Church has lost power, simply because it has not provided ways, by which this surplus of consecrated energy might find room for its exercise, within its sacred borders. A false conservatism has always looked askance upon anything that interfered with the prosy step, by which the journey thus far has been accomplished.

In order to arouse properly this strong right arm of the Church, and give it full sweep for its consecrated energy, there must be a less marked separation between the clergy and the people. The universal priesthood of believers, properly emphasized, will lift the people into a light and devotion corresponding at well nigh all points with the clergy. That there will be necessarily a difference is felt and acknowledged on every hand. It is the violent emphasis of this separation which has wrought such unbounded mischief. The layman has been forced into an awkward position, where neither life nor activity is expected of him. There is no reasonable ground for this remnant of medieval ecclesiasticism. Continuance of this separation under the false form given to it, when the priesthood of the ministry was so onesided as to crush every other feature of Christian activity, will demand a new reformation. The inseparable barrier between these two great factors of Christian life, has no foundation in reason, common sense or history. It was when Popery arose rampant and the sacredness of holy orders became a phantom that wooed the Church away from those lines, undoubtedly traced by the finger of its great Head, upon the horizon of human history, that the clergy and laity became placed in such false antagonism to each other so far as church work was concerned.

In the Apostolic Church, when the fresh buoyancy of youth was everywhere felt, there was theoretical and practical parity of all believers. They that were scattered abroad, when the first martyr seed of the Church was being sown with a wide opened hand, went everywhere preaching the word. The majority if not all of these were laymen. They did not wait even for directions from the Apostles, but moved by the Holy Ghost published abroad the words of eternal life. "It is impossible to trace a clear line of demarkation between the gift of prophecy and that of teaching. The latter, like the former, belonged to the Church without distinction of clergy. It remains an established fact that all believers had the right to teach in public worship."* Paul before he received the laying on of hands, for the full and formal consecration of his life to the ministry of the word, preached boldly at Damascus in the name of the Lord Jesus and disputed against the Grecian Jews. Aquila and Priscilla expounded unto Apollos the way of God more perfectly. There is abundant evidence, on every page of Apostolic history, that the prophetic element of clerical life was as readily acknowledged and exercised as the common duties of the religious life. It was commensurate with the universal priesthood of believers. The good sense of Apostolic Christianity, when it determined to turn the worship upside down, did not make such a fatal blunder, as to consign ninety-nine one hundredths of that fiery energy, born of the Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Spirit, to a listless inactivity. The Holy Ghost, finding willing hearts and ready hands, sent them forth on errands of mercy and grace. Investigations, from every historical standpoint, prove that the function of teaching and preaching were exercised by all who had the natural ability for this very especial function. According to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul, the liberty of prophesying was unhindered. This liberty did not, like the special charisms of the first age of Christianity disappear, but remain as a permanent right in subsequent ages.†

* Pressense's Apostolic Era, page 344.

† Hatch's Bampton Lectures, page 114.

In like manner the priestly functions of the ministry were to a large extent exercised by the believers as a body. There is no sacerdotalism in the New Testament. "The sacerdotal functions and privileges, which alone are mentioned in the apostolic writings, pertain to all believers alike and do not refer solely or specially to the ministerial office."* There is an absence of any appeal to sacerdotal claims in the Pastoral Epistles. The silence of the Apostolic fathers deserves to be mentioned."† In the early ages, teaching and baptism were joined together as now, and were performed by all. "It was at the beginning permitted to all to preach the gospel and to baptize and to explain the scriptures in the Church."‡ From ancient documents, and from the regulations required in the earlier councils, it is manifest that the whole round of Christian work was open to all, who possessed a natural fitness for it. Christians were to teach and preach and baptize. It was when such a state of affairs prevailed that a robust faith shows itself everywhere. Martyrs are as plentiful as the leaves of the Valambrosa. The great doctrines, which are the very foundation stones of our common Christianity are contended for with highpriestly solemnity.

When worldliness begins to creep into the Church, and gold flows into its coffers instead of blood into the arena—when the clergy begins to assume functions never designed to be exclusively their own, and the laity in consequence with all its splendid possibilities is forced into the background, we have sacerdotalism with its attendant decay and death. Well nigh all heroic defence of the faith, and burning desire for the conversion of the world to Christ died. The right of the laity to a voice in the government was never doubted in apostolic times. "In the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem the entire church participated. But with the rise of sacerdotalism the laity declined

* Lightfoot's Commentary on Philippians. Special Essay on the Christian Ministry, page 244.

† By the same, page 249.

‡ Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, page 913.

in power, until they were entirely ignored in the Church. Indeed the Council of Trent anathematizes the scripture idea of the priesthood of all believers." *

The Reformation began to enlist this long unused power. With the new life of faith that began to stir everywhere, there sprang up a new life of works. The Liberty of the Christian Man, of the sturdy Saxon Reformer, was the magna charta of laymen. It was evident to the most careless observer, that the layman had already been instant in season and out of season, and even though seriously hampered had already done much towards giving energy and direction to pre-reformation history. Humanism, that John the Baptist of the Reformation, demonstrated what a hearty alliance of laity and clergy might perform, in bringing about the new era of human history, which must break upon the world, if judgment day must not come at once. It was Reuchlin, a humanist and a layman, who vindicated the claims of science against the barbarous teaching of the times. "Ulrich von Hütten, who could fight for truth if he had not felt its power, flung down the gauge of battle, with all the knightly pride of chivalry. Erasmus, the clear-headed and brilliant coward, lampooned monks and doctors, until cardinals, and even the pope himself joined in the common laughter of the world." Melancthon, Calvin and a whole army of lesser lights proved to the world, what laymen when consecrated might do for the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ. John Wesley gave a great impetus towards restoring the Apostolic precedent of lay preaching. "The wonderful movement he inaugurated would have completely failed had he trusted entirely to an ordained ministry. But he wisely allowed great liberty to all, who were piously inclined and gifted in speech, and the consequence was that Methodism marvellously spread." Schaff-Herzog, page 1289. This middle wall of partition however has not been completely broken down. In life and activity, theoretically and practically, the layman is not expected to size

* Schaff-Herzog, vol. 2, page 1289.

up to the ministry. His associations and pleasures are not required by public sentiment to move along the same plain with that of his fellow laborers and Christian brothers. In trying to hold ourselves as ministers in such an abnormal position, we have put ourselves out of touch with the lay element in the Church. Sydney Smith had some ground for saying that the human race was divided into three classes, men, women and preachers. The masses have gotten away from us, and those who still hold to the Church do not feel themselves called upon to abound in the work of the Lord. They do not live on that high plane which successful leadership would imperiously require. Let it be understood that God requires a layman to live as holy and unblamably as a minister, and a rose would as easily be unfragrant as for that man to be inactive. May the day be at hand when this last vestige of mediæval ecclesiasticism will vanish away, and a new era of Church history be ushered in, by the adoption of the apostolic method, sanctioned by the success that has always attended its adoption, simply modified to suit the new times in which it has become an active element in Church life.

It is necessary for the Church to get a larger conception of its mission in the world. The spirit of monasticism fostered and fashioned an ideal for the Church, which has not been broad enough. It has about it the gloomy shade and musty smell of the cloister. It is only within the last fifty years that history has been properly written. It has dawned upon the historic muse at last, that nations, hitherto consigned to the limbo of nothingness, have been seething with divine human possibilities. It has not yet dawned upon the Church, that there is a wide range of social and political and artistic life, that can be and must be permeated by the Spirit of God. If the object of the Church be simply to give a good dose of gospel truth on Sunday, and to require the pastor to bring a solemn gloom into the household once or twice a year by making a pastoral visit, there is no need of lay activity. But if "Christians should be interested in and should foster all that is excellent in science or art or political life as that which is their proper business," then

the horizon has widened far beyond the widest vision of the best monasticism that ever lived or moved or had its being upon the earth. It is unfortunate that the name Church has been associated with the idea of worship, instruction and beneficence, only. The first two features of its life have been relegated to the clergy, and the latter has been fulfilled in the same spirit, with which the disciples wished to have the Saviour send the Syrophœnician woman away because she was crying after them.

The Church must find her inheritance. She has sought her life thus far without enlisting all her energies, and without entering into the new fields opened up before her on every side. She must count nothing foreign to her that is human. What a glorious day will dawn, "when Christians find out that their main business is to promote truth in all departments of human knowledge, and love in all the relations of human life; and that they have a concern also in all that beautifies and refines human existence, and that all the energy of their faith in God and in Christ is needed to sustain the progress of mankind, they will find out also that the ground of their discord recedes into its natural littleness, and that the faith by which they all are actuated is a great moral power as to the possession and use of which there is no controversy. That which is needed and for lack of which Christianity languishes is a wider outlook, a determination to look the world in the face without misgiving or mistrust, to spiritualize and harmonize, to foster and to inspire the various spheres and interests which the Providence of God opens to the men of our day."* Lacking this comprehensive view of the mission of the Church in the earth, there is no call for all men to lend a helping hand. There is no effort to make Christianity a power on the exchange, in the bank, and at the counter. Selfishness and greed run riot among men, who otherwise might be stars in the right hand of Him who walketh in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks. A Senator shocked the whole country by asserting that politics and the ten commandments had parted company, and yet he simply gave utter-

* Freemantle's Gospel of the Secular Life, page 9.

ance to a popular sentiment which if the Church has not practically taught, it has winked at when prevailing in the lives of a respectable portion of its communicants. He asserted a principle that governs three-fourths of the political activity of a country that professedly believes that the powers that be are ordained of God. The Church has settled down to such a low estate as to admit that the decisive and directing control of men's consciences among the greater part of human life, does not come within the range of its influence. Men driven to despair are trying to make the great secular influences form new religions. "Christianity becomes a small affair in the presence of other objects of absorbing interests instead of being the supreme spiritual influence which elevates and harmonizes all the spheres of human life." The results of this false conception, or I should rather say this limited conception of the wide range of human activities which are crying for and must have the sanctifying influences of Christianity, are too awful to contemplate. The minister has lost his power. The word that is in his hand is not a double-edged sword, that smites to the ground the unholy hand that is stretched forth to touch the ark of God, in which the covenant of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood is sacredly kept. He is no longer a prophet, who reasons of temperance and of righteousness and of judgment to come till the principalities of wickedness tremble. He does not awe Kings and violators of the divine law, till a fear of vengeance drives them to the foot of the humble Nazarene, begging for mercy and peace. He does not shake the thrones of wickedness and bid defiance to armies led on by a godless ambition. The laymen of the Church are not convinced that it is possible to execute the command of God—Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Christ undoubtedly looked forward to a time when every sphere of business, social, political and artistic activity should be brought into subjection unto Himself. He must reign till he hath put all things under His feet. When this is once recognized as the range of the church's activity, the ministry will not be required to do all

the work. It will be seen at once that a layman has not fulfilled the duties of the Christian life when he has simply given a respectful hearing to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is the minister's sin before God if a sound Gospel is not preached, but it is the layman's sin before God, if this Gospel does not permeate all the relations of human life. The layman is called of God to this service, as surely as the prophets and apostles of the olden times; and before God is ordained to this solemn and sacred work, as much as any minister who proclaims the truths of the Gospel. If the Church but once caught a glimpse of the glorious inheritance which God has provided for her, she would hasten to go up into it and could give herself no rest till all her spiritual children went up also with her. The ministry is blamed, but it could not do all the work of the Church. When the laity will have laid upon its conscience, the solemn, divine and heaven sent obligations it is under to make effective the redemption purchased for the world by the death of Christ, the energy of the Church now expended in pushing men into work will be required to steady the energies which are being hurried forward by an untempered enthusiasm. To you and to me my lay brother "is committed in these anxious days, that which is at once an awful responsibility and a splendid destiny, to transform this modern world into a Christian society, to change the socialism which is based on the assumption of clashing interests, into the social issue which is based on the sense of spiritual union, and to gather together the scattered forces of a divided Christendom into a confederation in which organization will be of less account than fellowship with one Spirit and faith in one Lord—with a communion wide as human life and deep as human need—into a church which shall outshine even the golden glory of its dawn by the splendor of its eternal noon." *

It is for the Church to throw open the blinds and let the Light of Life shine upon the great problems of human destiny; to hold them up with such serious earnestness, that their

* Hatch, Bampton Lectures, page 216.

realization will challenge all the consecrated energy of the lay element within its borders. The triumphs of Christianity, when it has been made co-extensive with all the demands of national and social life, will prove an inviting field for all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. In all the relationships of human life lay activity was never a more potent factor than now. In olden times one who could be a king was a rarity, now they have grown in almost endless profusion. It is for this same increasing power to be enlisted in the Church in order that by concentration, combination and co-operation, the scattered fragments of human life may coalesce into one grand mosaic of love around the cross of Christ. It was the proclamation of this catholic view of the mission of Christianity in the world that made Phillips Brooks a man of the people and for the people. They forgot that he was a preacher, and when hearing or reading his utterances, they felt themselves in the spiritual grasp of a well-rounded Christian man. His denomination could not claim him. Even this broad land was not big enough for the sweep of his energy. It will be the actualization of these same truths, in the lives and works of the followers of Christ, that will make all men know that Jesus is the life and the light of the world. "The special religious need of the present age is the release of religious truth from its bondage to ecclesiasticism. The Lord Jesus needs to be changed from a theological definition to a living force." Let earnest laymen become impressed with such exalted conceptions of the possibilities of church life, and the dry bones will begin to rattle with the breath of the new spirit that is blowing upon them. Now we are compelled to misquote the saying of the great voices in heaven. We are afraid to say the kingdoms of this world *are* become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and with our half-hearted faith in the divine human possibilities of the love of Christ, we say the kingdoms of this world *shall become* the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ. The Church manipulated by the ministry alone is only a pent-up Utica, which is thought of as well enough adapted to old

men and women, but will not recommend itself to the men and women who cannot be satisfied with anything short of the ideal of the New Testament.

The Rev. Charles Gore, one of the most hopeful figures in English thought in The Mission of the Church, makes an earnest plea, that the most important work the Church has to-day is in insisting on a sterner moral life, not more sacraments, but less cheating and lying and license being the day's crying need. We will find no more fault with our fathers for not entering into a possession so golden hued with millennial dawn than we will blame them for not discovering the uses of electricity. The times of such ignorance the Lord winked at. The ministry might well be regarded as the alpha and omega of Christian activity. But it must not be so now. The Church dare not be satisfied with the scanty pasturage of the mountains of Gilead, but must go over the Jordan into the fertile Esdraelon, now teeming with the possibilities of social amelioration. The problems of sociology and economics must be sacredly cherished and solved. The political economy of the Pauline Epistles and the Sermon on the Mount must transplant Adam Smith, Malthus and John Stuart Mill. When problems suggested by such a comprehensive view of the mission of the Church, become the practical instead of the possible, laymen will be driven by the Spirit of God into this harvest field, waving white with the grandest harvest that ever tempted the reapers of God. The moral forces which rule the world are the forces which religious truth and social science are both dealing with. "The two, social science and theology, have precisely the same problem, expressed on this side as the perfection of society, on that as the Kingdom of Heaven. Not only must there be a mutual understanding between these two forms of effort, there must be an extended, yes, a complete interlock of labor; and a theology which seeks the regeneration of society in ignorance of social laws is doomed to failure, and a sociology which does not place prominent among spiritual powers the power of faith, is striving to guide and lead them into excellence without imparting

the true life giving impulse." In other words, the problems of the minister and layman are, if not the same at all points, yet so complementary of and supplementary to each other, that the Church and society cannot be saved without both being permeated by the life of God.

The will of God must be done in the earth as well as in heaven. The angelic song of peace and good will once heard on Bethlehem's plain, must become the choral accompaniment of the hurrying life of these later centuries. Christ must be honored as worthy of dominion and power and honor and glory by all the complicated, social and business developments that may arise from the accumulated accretions of all the struggles of all the ages. Our Christianity must be catholic, rich in provisions for the whole faculties and being of man. With the expansion and complication of our modern life, religion must have a comprehensive grasp of all the elements of our well being, and not permit them to escape and break up in mischievous analysis and consign themselves to mischievous trusts.*

The laity has not been regarded as an essential element, even in the business management of the affairs of the church. With the widening idea of the grand mission of the church, he has been forging his way to the front. He has had to contend earnestly for the suffrage which he has attained; and when he has once gone into it, he holds it sometimes, sarcastically and severely reminded, that he enjoys his release from the pupilage of inactivity, to the courtesy of the clergy. There are conferences and conventions called church gatherings, but they are in reality as much an assembly of the clergy as in the days when popes and bishops legislated for the people, without much interest in their spiritual welfare. The layman, although a somewhat important factor in the make-up of the church, has small chance in the present management of ecclesiastical assemblages. The attendance of the majority of the laymen on these occasions is so far as my observation goes, more for ornament, than

* Martineau's Endeavors After the Christian Life. Vol. II., page 5.

use. Clergymen always head the committees, with but rare exceptions. They do the speaking, unless here and there will be found a layman with temerity enough to take up the gauntlet and assert his unqualified rights. The reports of a church convention published in one of our enterprising dailies always show to the world that the ministers are the principal men along every line. All this superinduces ecclesiastical dullness in the minds of the laymen. We are taught, that in the general work of the church the principal portion of it belongs to the minister. They do the planning and the execution so far as they are able. If they should fail to complete the task, or if they find they have assumed more than their unaided energies can accomplish, the layman may have a chance to help out. The Church of the nineteenth century will prove a ghastly failure unless the laymen will have laid upon their shoulders a goodly portion of the management of the church. The apostles displayed a vast deal of sanctified common sense, when they put upon their fellow-helpers all that they were able to bear. The unbending logic of events tells us, with a profounder eloquence than Jethro, that the thing that we do is not good, we will wear away ourselves and the people that is with us, we are not able to perform it ourselves alone. "We can affirm with confidence, that by the blessing God has laid upon lay agency in this century, He has impressed upon it the seal of His sanction. Therefore we have also the right to assert that the general recognition of this principle would contribute much to increase Christian life. We can easily see why it is so." Put upon the laymen their work. Lift them out of the position of being ornaments and make them pillars in the temple of our God. Wherever a layman can be used use him. It will not lower the responsibilities of the minister, and will not curtail its influence in the least, but will lift the whole Church up to a higher plain of living, and a more devoted adherence to Christ. Laymen will be transplanted from the hot-house of ease and lethargic inactivity into the broader fields of usefulness and power. Mischiefs now hatched in idle brains will be swept

away before this new swing of power, and desert wastes will blossom with roses of abounding life and charity.

Synods, assemblies and conferences are run by the ministers. Here the work of the Church is mapped out. The best means of executing the work are put in motion, but the voice of the laymen all this time, is like the cooing of a dove in a thunder-storm. A wide awake, active business man may crucify himself enough to endure a session or two of this kind of debilitation and ennui, but he will congratulate himself, that he will not be caught in such a sorry plight again. When requested by the congregation to become a member of some future deliberative body, he will kindly but firmly beg to be excused. He has served for ornamentation long enough, and now proposes to wait till a place is prepared for him or for those like him.

How then shall we develop the lay activity in our churches? Introduce apostolic methods so signally blessed where fairly tried. Brush away the medieval cobwebs that have long since lain thickly upon the fair face of some of the most successful methods in the past history of the Church. They may need some adaptation to the new circumstances under which we live, but the methods themselves bear the seal of the almighty Spirit upon them. How shall we develop the lay activity in the Church? Rise to our opportunity. "Let preacher and people realize that the master opportunity of Christendom is at hand, to magnify the Lord Christ as the life and light of the world, and the King whose right it is to reign in every affair of individual and associated men. The trumpet of God is sounding down along all the lines of human thought, for men who shall be quick to discern the signs of the times, and swift to make ready the way of the Lord. The age's divine necessity is apostles who, from amidst the darkness and the perplexities of our modern civilization, shall collect the wider and mightier visions of the Christ, and shall speed with divine eagerness and undaunted conviction to declare unto the institutions of men, "We have found the Messiah." * Rising to this opportunity,

* Hemon's Larger Christ, page 23.

the Church will enter upon the sublimest era, since the days of the Son of Man on the earth. Prophecies that have seemed to have as little connection with the toiling and sinning millions of the world, as a Zulu with a Beethoven symphony, will at once shake from themselves the neglect of the ages, and become a pillar of cloud and fire, instinct with paternal deity, to guide the nations into the promised land. Laymen, with but a spark of divine life in them, will exclaim with Messianic earnestness, Woe is me, if I do not the work that has fallen so bountifully to my hands. The cry from millions who to-day sit with folded hands, will be, Lord what wilt thou have me to do? It will be as though a John the Baptist had risen from the dead, or better still, as though a second Pentecost had come, and a new heavenly energy was driving men everywhere, to cry out men and brethren what shall we do?

How shall we develop our lay activity? Give our men and women something to do. Put upon them all the burdens that they will be able to bear. Take them into our confidence, when we are laying out our plans for Church work. Impose upon them a fair share of the responsibility, if the work of Christ is not carried forward to a goal, worthy of these times when the Great Head of the Church is ready to accomplish such wonderful things. Let them go with us into the highways and byways of life, or better yet send them where we will not be able to go; and in an incredibly short time they will come back saying, Lord even the devils of greed, of ambition and of selfishness are subject unto us. And common sense assures us, that men flushed with victories, attested so certainly by God, will give themselves no rest, till the last enemy has been conquered, and the last sheaf from the great harvest field of time is gathered into the garner of God.

IV.

THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

1793–1893.

BY REV. A. R. TRUXAL, D.D.

"*Γνῶθι σεαυτόν*" is a good and useful motto for the individual to adopt and carry out; for no one can have a proper conception of his mission in the world and of the consequent duties devolving upon him, until he has acquired a measurably full and correct knowledge of himself. He must know what he is before he can know what he ought to do. This same principle holds good also in its application to man in the organization of society. A nation must have a knowledge of its past history, of the various elements that enter into its constitution, and of its present resources and powers, in order that it may consciously and intelligently work out its own proper destiny. So a Church, as Churches in these modern times of Protestantism are constituted, needs from time to time to come to an ever fuller consciousness of its own being, in order that it may ever have a realizing sense of the mission which God in His providence has set before it to accomplish. To attain unto such self-consciousness it must study the course it has run in the past, its trials and struggles, its failures and accomplishments, its elements of strength and of weakness, its present resources and opportunities. *Know Thyself* is an injunction unto which every branch of the Christian Church ought never cease to give heed.

In this Centennial year, the Reformed Church in the United

States is challenged to enter upon a thorough self-examination with the view of obtaining a fuller and more correct knowledge of herself, so that she may properly realize the responsibilities and obligations resting upon her in her relation to future ages. What is the Reformed Church in distinction from other Churches in the land? What has been her history in the past? What is the nature of the religious inheritance which her spiritual forefathers have placed in her hands? What is the mission that now lies before her? What can she accomplish and what ought she seek to accomplish for the advancement and enhancement of the Kingdom of Christ in the world? These questions ought during this present year to be prayerfully considered and earnestly studied by the Church with the view of reaching a state of fuller and clearer self-consciousness. Know thyself is the motto that should guide us in this period of rejoicing and thanksgiving to the Lord for His manifold mercies shown towards us and for His various blessings bestowed upon us as a Church during the first century of our separate existence in this country. For the purpose of contributing at least a small share to the effort the Church is at this time making to come to a proper knowledge of herself and a correct conception of her present and future mission, this paper is offered to the columns of the REVIEW.

From the year 1720, Reformed ministers came to the American colonies as missionaries to organize congregations and minister to the spiritual necessities of the German and Swiss settlers holding the faith as formulated in the Heidelberg catechism. In 1747, the first effort was made to effect an organization of the scattered pastors and churches of this country. Until 1793, the Reformed Church in the United States was subject to the authority and management of her foster mother, the Reformed Church of Holland. From the meeting of synod convened in the town of Lancaster in the year 1793 dates the history of the Reformed Church as a separate and distinct ecclesiastical organization in this new land.

The fathers of a century ago in assuming the responsibilities

of an independent synod were not actuated by a spirit of pride or self-glory; nor yet by an undutiful or rebellious spirit. They were forced by providential events and circumstances to take the step they did. The American Colonies had withdrawn their allegiance to the British Crown, and become free and independent states under a government of their own creation. This new political status of the country exerted a silent yet powerful influence upon the Churches in the land. Communication with the Church across the Atlantic was difficult and tedious. The demands of the Reformed Church were increasing on all sides. The classes and synod of Holland naturally began to feel that it was about time for the German portion of the Reformed Church in this country to assume the management of their own affairs. Because of all these facts and considerations the synod felt itself constrained to take upon itself the responsibilities and consequences of a separate existence. The apple when ripe drops from the parent stem. The Church was ripe for the movement inaugurated by our fathers. They were but faithful to the trust which providence had placed in their hands.

Nevertheless, it required unwavering faith and Christian heroism for the pastors and elders in that day to assume the obligations involved in the undertaking. For let us bear in mind the fact, that in addition to the weakness of the Church in respect of numbers and wealth, they did not possess any of those instrumentalities so very essential for developing the resources and carrying on the work of a Church. They had no constitution, properly speaking, no college or seminary or school of any kind, no church paper or religious periodical, no mission Board, or any other Board. All these things remained yet to be acquired. The strength and ingenuity of the ministers, who for more than a half century had been laboring in the country, had been taxed to their utmost in furnishing the widely scattered people and congregations of the Reformed faith with the means of grace. As a consequence no provision whatever had as yet been made for doing Church work in an organized manner.

The organization of an independent synod and the assumption of consequent duties at once quickened somewhat the latent energies of the Church. Still the servants of the Lord made haste very slowly. In those early days of the Republic progress was not rapid in any department of human affairs. That age was very different from the present. As much progress is now made in a single year as was then made in ten or twenty years. The Church advanced slowly indeed. The number of ministers, however, was gradually increased by the reception of some from foreign countries, and by the occasional ordination of others prepared for the sacred office by private instruction.

As pastors pressed to the then frontiers in all directions the synod gradually came to cover a considerable territory. Ministers and delegate elders met in the annual sessions of synod, canvassed the condition and needs of the various congregations and of the Reformed people in destitute places, managed the affairs of the Church as best they could, and made such provision for meeting the demands of the times as their limited means and resources permitted. On account of the comparatively long distances to be traveled by many of the members, and the laborious and fatiguing mode of making journeys in those days of no railroads, it followed as a necessary consequence that a goodly number of ministers and elders were each year prevented from attending the meeting of synod. The synod was consequently gradually led to take a forward step in the matter of organization. In 1820 classes were constituted. The synod was divided into seven districts, each of which was organized into a classis. The classes then sent delegates to synod to report the work accomplished, and the condition and needs of the Church in their several districts, and to bring back the actions, the requirements and directions of synod. In adopting the classical form of organization the synod followed the order that had very generally prevailed in the Reformed Church of the European continent from the days of John Calvin onward.* The good results flowing from the organiza-

* For many of the facts contained in this article we are indebted to the "Historic Manual," by Rev. Dr. J. H. Dubbs, of Lancaster, Pa.

tion of classes were soon manifest. In the first place the ministers and elders of the various sections of the Church were annually brought together in the meetings of their classes for conference and association in Church work. They were thus enabled to mutually encourage, support and enthuse one another in their labors. The needs of each portion of the Church were more fully and intelligently discovered, and its resources more efficiently developed. The new arrangement in a short time caused local improvements in Church affairs. And in the second place the synod itself was also much benefited by the classical order. Growing interest in its meetings soon manifested itself. A new life was quickened in the body. Its business became more various and gradually assumed a largely increased volume. Ministers and elders from the classes went up to synod with enlarged ideas and clearer conceptions of the work to be accomplished, and with more definite purposes in view. The importance of the synodical meetings was very much enhanced. The organization of classes dates the starting point of a new period of the history of our Church in this country. Pastors and people now began to realize, as they had not done before, that the Reformed Church had a mission to fulfill; and the extent and greatness of the work to be accomplished dawned upon their minds as never before.

The crying demand of that period was (as has indeed always been the case in the Reformed Church), for more ministers of the Gospel to fill the many vacant charges and to occupy the waste places of the Church. In 1826 the Committee on Missions reported no less than 84 vacant congregations, and Dr. Gerhart is authority for the statement that in those early days at one time 150 congregations were without regular pastors.* The foreign supply was altogether inadequate to meet the demand; and in numerous instances ministers from abroad were not adaptod to the work in this new country. In order to create a supply a number of pastors in different sections of the

*See "Additional Professorships in the Theological Seminary," by Professor E. V. Gerhart, D.D., Lancaster, Pa., page 4.

Church took young men under their care, instructed and trained them for the pastoral office. A good work was accomplished for the Church in this way. This order, however, had necessarily to be only temporary. The number thus prepared was still insufficient; and those brought into the ministry by this means were not as fully equipped for their life's work as they should have been. The church then, as always, needed a gospel ministry fully educated and thoroughly prepared for their work. Because of the lack of ministers the Reformed Church has all along her history lost heavily in membership. Many of her best people have united with congregations of other Churches because their own Church was not able to furnish them with the means of divine grace.

The need of a regularly and permanently established school to prepare young men for the gospel ministry had been felt for many years. But the inability of the Church to establish and endow such a school was just as keenly felt. The people in those days were not rich in this world's goods. But dire necessity at length compelled the Church to move in the matter. The first positive action looking towards the establishment of a Theological Seminary was taken by the synod of York, in 1817, the twenty-fourth year of the synod's independency. During the years immediately following a number of different projects were considered and attempted. These were: Union with the Lutherans in establishing a school; union with the Dutch Reformed in their school; union of some kind with the Presbyterians at Princeton. All these plans however failed, mainly for the reason that the Reformed Church gradually came to the consciousness that, if she was to maintain her independent existence and be faithful to the trust which God in His providence had evidently committed to her, she must have a school of her own and educate her own ministry. After years of agitation and deliberation, after much discussion and prayerful consideration, after many trials and vexatious disappointments, the synod, in the year 1825, opened a Theological Seminary at Carlisle, Pa., with one professor and five

students. It is not our purpose in this connection to follow the history of the Seminary in its wanderings from Carlisle to York and from York to Mercersburg, nor to describe the great trials and difficulties through which it passed until it became established and comparatively well endowed at the latter place. For a full history of this period the reader is referred to the interesting books of Dr. Theodore Appel on "College Recollections" and the "Beginnings of the Seminary."

The founders of the Seminary were not long in discovering that their work would be largely unfruitful of the desired good results, unless provision were made for furnishing the young men with a scientific and classical education previous to their admission to the study of theology. Consequently a collegiate school was established in 1829, which in 1835 became Marshall College at Mercersburg. The College must lay the foundation in the educational culture of the student, upon which the Seminary must then build the theological course. The College is a necessity to the Seminary; and a crippled College makes a weak Seminary.

The decade from 1825 to 1835, in which our first schools struggled into existence, marks an important epoch in the history of our Church, from which dates an era of new life and spirit, and of marked progress in all the affairs of the Church. The classes of College and Seminary filled up with students, and from year to year young men well equipped for their calling were sent out to be ordained to the gospel ministry. Church papers and theological periodicals were established, the cause of Missions was prosecuted in a systematic manner, the cords of our Reformed Zion were lengthened from time to time and her stakes strengthened all round. In 1824, the year before the Seminary was formally opened, the statistics of our Church, as nearly as can be ascertained, were 1 synod, 64 ministers, 233 congregations and from fifteen to twenty thousand members, with no instrumentality whatever for doing church work in a general way. This was the feeble standing of the Reformed Church after 30 years of her synodical independence and after 100 years of her existence in this new world.

Our showing to-day is 1 general synod, 8 district synods, 56 classes, 900 ministers and 215,000 members. We have four theological seminaries in different sections of the church, six colleges, five classical schools and several female seminaries. Four weekly church papers are published; one Theological Review of a high grade and a number of other religious publications for families, missionary societies and Sunday-schools. We have three Homes for the maintenance of poor orphans, and a Beneficiary Society furnishing aid to needy widows of ministers. The work of Home and Foreign Missions is being vigorously prosecuted under the management of Boards constituted by the General Synod. When our first schools were founded the Synod was obliged to look to other denominations or to the Church of Europe to furnish the men to fill the various professorships. Now we have a sufficient number of ministers and educated laymen well qualified to form a dozen of faculties were it necessary to do so. This gratifying growth and progress along all lines must be largely attributed to the work accomplished by our institutions of learning. Let praise and honor be given to our ecclesiastical forefathers for their wisdom and self-sacrificing labors in establishing them!

The Reformed Church is more alive and active to-day than she ever was. She is every year becoming more fully conscious of her mission under the providence of God, of her prerogatives and opportunities, of her responsibilities and duties; and she is every day putting forth renewed efforts to carry out the trust imposed upon her.

In studying the history of the Reformed Church, as this was developed during the first century of her existence as a separate and distinct ecclesiastical body in this country, we must take notice not only of her outward growth and external enlargement, but also of her internal activity and development—her struggles, conflicts and conquests in the sphere of thought and knowledge. Since the establishment of her institutions of learning much has been accomplished by her in the department of Theology. Indeed back of the external growth of the

Church lay the philosophical mode of thought and the theological conceptions of divine truth that had come to prevail as the motive cause of the work accomplished *ad extra*.

Professors of History, Philosophy, and Theology in all its various branches ought to be live, active thinkers. In order to be faithful to their trust they must investigate, study and think for themselves. And such has been the character of the leading men who have had charge of the original college and seminary of the church from the beginning of their establishment until now. Drs. F. A. Rauch, John W. Nevin and Phillip Schaff were the professors who gave the theology of the Reformed Church in this country a distinctive character. They were men of great learning, wide grasp of mind and profound thought. They laid down certain general principles of philosophy, of history in general and church history in particular, and of theology, which in their lectures to the students and in their published writings they wrought out and applied, positively and negatively, in the various departments of knowledge. Thus they founded and developed a mode of thought and a system of theology that attracted the attention of leading theologians in this country and in Europe. They opened up new lines of thought and research, and thereby caused their students and the ministry of the Church at large to pursue their investigations and studies with lively earnestness and loving zeal.

The new treatment of historical and theological problems by our professors was not, however, allowed to pass unchallenged. It met with opposition both from within the Reformed Church and from certain quarters outside of it. Charges of heresy were at different times preferred, but when investigated and tested they fell helplessly and hopelessly to the ground. And opposition and persecution served only to call forth reassertions and fuller statements of the positions held by the professors. As a consequence the Reformed Church during the latter half of the century now completed passed through a period of intense theological activity. There was on the part of teachers

and students an earnest struggling and fearless grappling with the whole range of theological problems. The word of God was thoroughly studied; the teachings of the early church fathers were carefully investigated; the past history of the Christian Church was zealously studied; and the history of the various doctrines of the church was accurately traced. The relation of the Reformed Church in this country to the church of the past, and her relation to the present and future church of America were canvassed and defined.

The subjects that during this period received especial attention and elaborate treatment were, The Person of Christ, The Church as the Body of Christ, The Mystical Union of the Believer with Christ, The Nature and Purpose of the Holy Sacraments. The discussion of these questions led then necessarily also to the consideration of Christian cultus and divine worship. With the investigation of the true mode of worship came in then the question of liturgy. Over the liturgical question was fought a long and fierce battle. But, while the contention was ostensibly about the liturgy, the real questions involved were much broader and lay much deeper than the superficial question of mode of worship. The reconsideration of all these various subjects of dogmatic and practical theology, and their restatement according to the conceptions of our leading theologians, called forth criticism and opposition, and occasioned a controversy that was long, earnest and learned, and we are sorry to say, sometimes bitter and even discourteous. But the effect of it was that nearly all our ministers and many of our intelligent laymen studied theology in those days and became well founded and grounded in the faith; so that a learned divine of a sister denomination, who was in a position to form a correct judgment in the case, was constrained to say that no church in the land produced a larger proportion of well-trained theologians among her ministry than did the Reformed Church.

During the period between 1844, the year of Dr. Schaff's arrival, and 1878, when the peace measure was adopted, an immense quantity and a great variety of theological literature

was produced in our church, consisting of articles published in various periodicals and of pamphlets and books issued from time to time. If these productions were carefully collected, judiciously selected and properly arranged under general heads, they would constitute a most valuable theological library. It seems to us that such a work ought yet to be performed by the Church. If some of our brethren of sister denominations, who are in these latter days considerably agitated by theological views that seem to them somewhat new and peculiar, were to take the pains of studying our literature bearing more or less directly on the vexed questions before them, they could not fail to receive much light and derive great benefit therefrom.

Honest and charitable controversy is no evil. It is always productive of good results. While some phases of the theological warfare and ecclesiastical strife, through which the Reformed Church has passed, were and are to be deplored, mainly because of the spirit manifested by some of the contestants, nevertheless, upon the whole, great good resulted to the Church from the prolonged conflict of ideas. By means of the controversy the Church was brought to a clearer sense of her divine heritage and a fuller consciousness of her mission among the other branches of the Protestant Church in this country.

Any church that claims the right to a separate existence ought to be able to confront the world with some peculiar phase of divine truth, either in the matter of a doctrine or cultus, or government or practical operation. Any denomination that does not represent an important differentiation, of some kind, from the Church as a whole as represented by the other denominations, necessarily partakes of the nature of schism, and hence has no justification for its separate existence. It ought to disband and be merged into other branches of the Church.

The Reformed Church differs from the Lutheran Church. At the very beginning of the Reformation, Protestantism fell into two divisions; the one becoming the Reformed Church and the other the Lutheran. These two branches have from the begin-

ning until now been kept apart by some important and more or less fundamental doctrinal differences.

The Reformed Church differs from the Episcopal Church, more especially as regards the doctrine of the ministry and of church government.

The Reformed Church differs in various particulars from all churches of Baptistic and Methodistic persuasions.

The Reformed Church is not the same as the Presbyterian Church. We differ from them in regard to some fundamental principles in theology; in regard to some particular doctrines, and in the matter of cultus. We have our own separate and independent history reaching back to the very earliest beginnings of the great Reformation of the 16th Century; we represent a type of faith and piety and service of the Master that is different from that prevailing among Presbyterian people.

And we differ from other churches in one or more particulars, not for the sake of differing simply, but because our theology in the light of God's word and as elucidated by history commends itself most favorably to our minds, and because our mode of worship and form of service are most congenial to the religious feelings of our hearts. FOR US, our faith and cultus and way of serving the Lord are the best.

In taking the above position it might perhaps be supposed that we as a Church cherish a sectarian spirit, and stand opposed to all efforts at church union. But such is not the case at all. We are of all Churches most liberal. We claim nothing for ourselves that we are not willing to allow unto others. We unchurch no one who believes in the triune God and seeks to obey His Commandments. And we are ready and willing to enter into a federal union with the Dutch Reformed, the Presbyterian or the Lutheran Church, or with all of them, in such manner as will not do violence to our own individuality. Such a union would of course have to be based, not on doctrine, but on faith in its specific sense. Doctrinal differences will always exist; but there is only one Lord, one Faith and one Baptism. The position of the Reformed Church would permit her to co-

operate in an organized way with any other denomination on the basis of the Apostles' Creed and a few additional articles, that would exclude such denominations as unchurch her members, as for example the Episcopal or Baptist Church. We are in favor of church union, and are willing to unite with other denominations of kindred faith on some federal plan on the general principle laid down by the Apostle Paul when he says that there are diversities of gifts, differences of administration and diversities of operation, but the same Spirit, the same Lord, and the same God who worketh all in all. The writer does not for a moment presume in this paper and especially in this paragraph to speak for the Church or for any one but himself; but the general position of the Reformed Church as he apprehends it, justifies the statements above made.*

But the Reformed Church, whether as a member of a union, or as a separate ecclesiastical body, must maintain her own individuality and perform her God-given work in her own way. We know that there are those of our number who evidently imagine that the duty of our Church in the present day and generation, is to become as much as possible like some other denominations; that our distinctive features ought to be minimized if not indeed suppressed; and that the features which we have in common with other churches ought to be developed and held forth prominently. But if that be the true position for us to take then we really no longer have any mission of our own, and we might as well disband and become absorbed into the Episcopal Church on the one hand and into the Presbyterian Church on the other hand. We have, however, in our

*Since this paper was written an editorial appeared in the *Reformed Church Messenger* describing the general and generous willingness of our Church to enter into a proposed union with the Dutch Reformed Church, in which the writer makes the following statement: "On the question of Church Union, so vital and potent in our day, this action we have sketched, running through a series of years, *places the Reformed Church in the United States into a position which gives it front rank* among all the Churches which aim for the much desired end." This sentiment is in entire harmony with the views we have above expressed.

possession an ecclesiastical and theological heritage that ought to be maintained and cultivated. In our opinion we as a Church would be guilty of a grievous wrong if we suffered our possessions to become despoiled. The Reformed Church would be untrue to her whole past history, ignorant of her present mission and unfaithful to her Lord and Master if she did not uphold and emphasize her own peculiar features in respect of Christian doctrines and religious customs and life.

Again, we find those who say that our mission is to be accomplished theologically by the maintenance and advocacy of the old doctrines of the Reformed Church. Just what is meant by this claim we do not know. It is true, the Church must never ignore her continuity with the past. The true and the good of the old must be preserved in the new. To cut absolutely and entirely loose from all past history would be revolutionary and sacrilegious. The effort of any one to cast aside the vast accumulation of wisdom and piety in past ages but reveals his own ignorance and folly; and the success of such an effort would open the way for an immense amount of injury and evil. There is a very important sense in which we are bound by the past. But if it be meant that an effort ought to be made to transfer in an outward way the exact views and precise teaching of the Reformed Church in another country and of a former age, to the Church of the present day in this land and nation, then the position is a false one. Repristination is an impossibility. And if it were possible for the Church of any day to do her thinking according to the same forms and by the same processes of thought of a former period, it would be useless for her to make the attempt; for the world having advanced could not be impressed or influenced to any appreciable degree by the truth as apprehended in days and circumstances of the past. History is a real life movement, a continual becoming. Ideas, it is true, are very slowly developed both in Church and State. It often requires centuries for new ideas to strike deep root and become fruitful in influence and results. Neverthe-

less old ideas are in the course of time modified and finally they outlive their regnant power and lose their force; and new conceptions of the truth gradually come to prevail and reign. Truth is everlasting and never changes; for truth is divine. The Son of God in human flesh declared; I am the way, the truth and the life. But man's conceptions of the truth are always more or less imperfect and inadequate. Hence human views must needs be modified, corrected and enlarged from time to time in the ever-increasing light of the ages as they come and go. It is consequently an error to assume that the theological thinking of the present day ought to be or can be rigidly bound down to the apprehensions and conceptions of divine truth that prevailed in the Church one or more centuries ago. To be true to our mission in these latter days we dare not be bound by unyielding fetters to an antiquated or dead theology. Theology is a living science, is never finished, and must always keep abreast with the age of the world.

Again: theological conceptions are always modified somewhat by the character and spirit of the nation in which they prevail. The human mind is wondrously conditioned and influenced by its surroundings and by the national life of which it is the outgrowth. The German cast of mind differs from that of the French; the French from the English; and the English from the Scotch. The American nation is the resultant of a mixture in the main of English, Scotch, Irish, German and Swiss blood. The American mind as a consequence is not the exact pattern of any foreign mind: and its apprehension and grasp of the truth are influenced and modified by its own peculiar characteristics. The theology and Christian life of the general Church in the United States must necessarily have a character and coloring of their own. And the Reformed Church in this country must consequently also develop and maintain a theology and cultus of her own. She cannot import these ready-made. Our national life and spirit, our peculiar conditions and circumstances, demand a phase of Christian doctrines and a type of

religion and piety, of the present day and strictly our own. The poet has well said,

> "New occasions teach new duties,
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> We must upward still and onward,
> If we would keep abreast of truth."

The end of the first century of our independent existence brings us into a remarkable period of the world's history, and connects us with a marvellous stage of our country's development. The powers of this present world seem to be all astir in the present day. There is a wonderful commotion on the sea of humanity. Immigration to our country has become bewildering in extent. The development of the various resources of our land is being pushed forward on all sides on gigantic scales and with confounding rapidity. Towns are springing up in all directions and cities are fast assuming immense proportions. Our mining interests, manufacturing establishments, mercantile business and agricultural pursuits are growing and expanding in a manner and to an extent that startles the world. The masses are running to and fro bent on money-making and money-getting. The spirit of worldliness is rampant and seems to carry everything before it in its mad career. Selfishness reigns supreme. Skepticism and infidelity are on the increase poisoning the minds and hearts of men, women and children. Old forms of faith and doctrine are losing their hold on the Christian public. The theological world is in more or less confusion. Forces once powerful are weakening and breaking up. Indeed the condition of society from centre to circumference is such as would seem soon to land it on the verge of moral and spiritual ruin; and we might well be tempted to yield to hopeless despair were we not encouraged, by our faith in the triune God, our faith in divine providence, our faith in the Church, and in humanity too, to believe and feel very sure that notwithstanding the vast extent and great activity of the powers of this present world, and notwithstanding the terrible rush and confusion of error, evil and sin, still truth and righteousness will in the end

prevail, and the Kingdom of God and His Christ will overcome all opposition, conquer all enemies and eventually be established in all the earth.

And the Reformed Church, in common with all Churches, is called upon to enter the conflict boldly and do successful battle with the hosts of wickedness. We are now in this centennial year of 1893 challenged as synods and classes, as pastors, elders and deacons, yea as men and women enlisted in the cause of the Lord and His Kingdom, to enlarge our institutions of learning and make them more efficient, to place in our pulpits ministers better equipped for the great work of their calling; to labor more prayerfully and zealously for the upbuilding of our congregations, for the development of our resources, for the spread of the gospel among the people of our own land and in foreign countries among heathen nations, for the conversion of sinners and the confirmation of believers in faith and piety, and for the establishment of truth, righteousness and peace in all the world.

The Reformed Church is challenged before the world to develop a theology and cultus distinctly her own, and, with her conceptions of God's truth clearly defined and strongly emphasized, to go forth and assail the common enemy and make her influence felt; and according as she faithfully responds to this challenge will she accomplish her mission in the present day and in ages to come.

V.

EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

BY REV. T. G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

"MODERM PESSIMISM AND OPTIMISM."

"MODERN thought is making a fresh start from the base whence Indian and Greek philosophy set out; and, the human mind being very much what it was six-and-twenty centuries ago, there is no ground for wonder if it presents indications of a tendency to move along the old lines to the same results. We are more than sufficiently familiar with modern pessimism, at least as a speculation; for I cannot call to mind that any of its present votaries have sealed their faith by assuming the rags and the bowl of the mendicant Bhikku, or the cloak and the wallet of the Cynic. The obstacles placed in the way of sturdy vagrancy by an unphilosophical police have, perhaps, proved too formidable for philosophical consistency. We also know modern speculative optimism, with its perfectibility of the species, reign of peace, and lion and lamb transformation scenes; but one does not hear so much of it as one did forty years ago; indeed, I imagine it is to be met with more commonly at the tables of the healthy and wealthy than in the congregations of the wise.

"The majority of us, I apprehend, profess neither pessimism nor optimism. Further, I think I do not err in assuming that, however diverse their views on philosophical and religious matters, most men are agreed that the proportion of good and evil in life may be very sensibly affected by human action. I never heard anybody doubt that the evil may be thus increased or diminished; and it would seem to follow that good must be-

similarly susceptible of addition or subtraction. The prepounders of what are called the 'ethics of evolution,' when the 'evolution of ethics' would usually better express the object of their speculations, adduce a number of more or less interesting facts and more or less sound arguments, in favor of the origin of the moral sentiments, in the same way as other natural phenomena, by a process of evolution. I have little doubt, for my own part, that they are on the right track, but as the immoral sentiments have no less been evolved, there is, so far, as much natural sanction for the one as the other. The thief and the murderer follow nature just as much as the philanthropist.

"Cosmic evolution may teach us how the good and the evil tendencies of man may have come about; but, in itself, it is incompetent to furnish any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before. Some day, I doubt not, we shall arrive at an understanding of the evolution of the æsthetic faculty; but all the understanding in the world will neither increase nor diminish the force of the intuition that this is beautiful and that is ugly. There is another fallacy which appears to me to pervade the so-called 'ethics of evolution.' It is the notion that because, on the whole, animals and plants have advanced in perfection of organization by means of the struggle for existence and the consequent 'survival of the fittest,' therefore men in society, men as ethical beings must look to the same process to help them toward perfection. I suspect that this fallacy has arisen out of the unfortunate ambiguity of the phrase 'survival of the fittest.' 'Fittest' has a connotation of 'best,' and about 'best' there hangs a moral flavor. In cosmic nature, however, what is 'fittest' depends upon the conditions.

"WEAKEST, BUT 'FITTEST.'

"Long since, I ventured to point out that if our hemisphere were to cool again, the survival of the fittest might bring about, in the vegetable kingdom, a population of more and more stunted and humbler and humbler organisms, until the 'fittest'

that survived might be nothing but lichens, diatoms and such microscopic organisms as those which give red snow its color; while, if it becomes hotter, the pleasant valleys of the Thames and Isis might be uninhabitable by any animated beings save those that flourish in a tropical jungle. They, as the fittest, the best adapted to the changed conditions, would survive. As I have already urged, the practice of that which is ethically best—what we call goodness or virtue—involves a course of conduct which, in all respects, is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In place of ruthless self-assertion it demands self-restraint; in place of thrusting aside, or treading down, all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but shall help his fellows; its influence is directed, not so much to the survival of the fittest, as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive.

"It repudiates the gladiatorial theory of existence. It demands that each man who enters into the enjoyment of the advantages of a polity shall be mindful of his debt to those who have laboriously constructed it, and shall take heed that no act of his weakens the fabric in which he has been permitted to live. It is from neglect of these plain considerations that the fanatical individualism of our time attempts to apply the analogy of cosmic nature to society. Once more we have a mis-application of the stoical injunction to follow nature; the duties of the individual to the State are forgotten and his tendencies to self-assertion are dignified by the name of rights. It is seriously debated whether the members of a community are justified in using their combined strength to constrain one of their number to contribute his share to the maintenance of it, or even to prevent him from doing his best to destroy it. The struggle for existence, which has done such admirable work in cosmic nature, must, it appears, be equally beneficent in the ethical sphere. Yes, if that which I have insisted upon is true, if the cosmic process has no sort of relation to moral ends, if the imitation of it by man is inconsistent with the first principles of ethics, what becomes of this surprising theory?

"THE BATTLE WITH COSMIC NATURE.

"Let us understand, once for all, that the ethical progress of society depends, not on imitating the cosmic process, still less in running away from it, but in combating it. In every family, in every polity that has been established, the cosmic process in man has been restrained and otherwise modified by law and custom; in surrounding nature it has been similarly influenced by the art of the shepherd, the agriculturist, the artisan. As civilization has advanced, so has the extent of this interference increased until the organized and highly-developed sciences and arts of the present day have endowed man with a command over the course of non-human nature greater than that once attributed to the magicians. The most impressive, I might say startling, of these changes have been brought about in the course of the last two centuries, while a right comprehension of the process of life and of the means of influencing its manifestations is only just dawning upon us.

"We do not yet see our way beyond generalities, and we are befogged by the obtrusion of false analogies and crude anticipations. But astronomy, physics, chemistry have all had to pass through similar phases before they reached the stage at which their influence became an important factor in human affairs. Physiology, psychology, ethics, political science must submit to the same ordeal. Yet it seems to me irrational to doubt that, at no distant period, they will work as great a revolution in the sphere of practice. The theory of evolution encourages no millennial anticipations. If, for millions of years, our globe has taken the upward road, yet, sometime, the summit will be reached and the downward route will be commenced. The most daring imagination will hardly venture upon the suggestion that the power and the intelligence of man can ever arrest the procession of the great year. Moreover, the cosmic nature born with us, and, to a large extent, necessary for our maintenance, is the outcome of millions of years of severe training,

and it would be folly to imagine that a few centuries will suffice to subdue its masterfulness to purely ethical ends.

"Ethical nature may count upon having to reckon with a tenacious and powerful enemy as long as the world lasts. But, on the other hand, I see no limit to the extent to which intelligence and will, guided by sound principles of investigation and organized in common effort, may modify the conditions of existence for a period longer than that now covered by history. And much may be done to change the nature of man himself. The intelligence which has converted the brother of the wolf into the faithful guardian of the flock ought to be able to do something toward curbing the instincts of savagery in civilized men But if we may permit ourselves a larger hope of abatement of the essential evil of the world than was possible to those who, in the infancy of exact knowledge, faced the problems of existence more than a score of centuries ago, I deem it an essential condition of the realization of that hope that we should cast aside the notion that the escape from pain and sorrow is the proper object of life.

"We have long since emerged from the heroic childhood of our race, when good and evil could be met with the same 'frolic welcome;' the attempts to escape from evil, whether Indian or Greek, have ended in flight from the battlefield; it remains to us to throw aside the youthful over-confidence and the no less youthful discouragement of nonage. We are grown men and must play the man—

> strong in will
> To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield,

cherishing the good that falls in our way and bearing the evil, in and around us, with stout hearts set on diminishing it. So far we all may strive in one faith toward one hope:—

> It may be that the gulfs will wash us down,
> It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
> . . . . but something ere the end,
> Some work of noble note may yet be done."

We give the above extract from the lecture of Professor

Thomas H. Huxley at Oxford on "Ethics and Evolution," in order to append to it a few remarks.* It will be seen that Prof. Huxley finds one of the greatest difficulties in the theory of Evolution when he comes to consider the ethical problem of the human race. A careful reading will show also, we think, a remarkable agreement of Prof. Huxley's views with Christianity on this subject. More and more it appears that the harmony between Science and Revelation is being wrought out by a careful study of the theory of Evolution. Evolution presents a profound truth, but in order to understand and interpret it aright we need the light of Christianity, and we think Prof. Huxley in this lecture grants substantially the truths of Christianity as applied to the Ethical Problem.

We are not of those who deny that Evolution has anything to do with Ethics, that when we come to consider the ethical life of man we must part company entirely with the theory of Evolution. Man's ethical nature is subject to evolution as well as his physical nature. The natural basis for this evolution is to be found in the two forces at work in the unfolding of his moral nature, the idea of Right, which leads to the assertion of the individual, and the idea of Social Integration, which asserts the social principle, or the force of the general in society. These two forces lie at the basis of man's ethical development. The idea of *right* is intuitive in man, and in its operation it unfolds the doctrine of *rights* in their concrete form. The assertion of his rights grows out of the independence of the individual, and sets him over against the operation of the social principle, which would otherwise swallow up the individual in

* We quote from a lengthy extract as given in the Philadelphia *Press* of a recent date, to which is added also the following as published in a religious periodical, the *Presbyterian*, of the same city: Herbert Spencer also, in the 2d vol. of his most laborious work, "The Principles of Ethics," is quoted as saying: "The doctrine of Evolution has not furnished guidance to the extent I had hoped." Mr. Mivart, the distinguished English naturalist, has also acknowledged, within a short time, that "Evolution may produce man, the *animal*, but must stop there; it cannot produce the intellectual or spiritual part of man."

the general. The principle of Social Integration on the other hand attracts the individual to society, the general, in the family, the state, etc.

Now these two principles are adumbrated by the forces of attraction and repulsion in inorganic nature, the centripetal and centrifugal forces in the harmonious revolution of the heavenly bodies, and again in the organic world, the force of the principle of life over against the opposition of its surrounding conditions, its environment.

We might go on to show how the doctrine of rights has been developed in Common Law, Statute Law, and Jurisprudence, and how the social principle has been developed in the family, the state, &c. But our object in these few remarks has been merely to show that man's moral nature, both in the individual and in society, is subject to evolution from ground forces lodged in his nature.

But just here we meet a difficulty which evolution, in itself, is not able to solve, and that is *the presence of sin and misery in the world.*

We see nature developing according to fixed immutable laws, and working out its cosmic problem with unerring certainty, but when we come to man's ethical nature we meet with a new and different condition. We meet pain and suffering, and not only this, but we see that all suffering is a consequence originally of a violation of law. Man is the author of his own suffering. He has a will to choose the good or the evil. We meet here the presence and activity of sin, and man's responsibility for sinning or not sinning is universally acknowledged; else why is he punished for doing wrong? Is, then, sin a necessary condition for the evolution of man's ethical nature? So it has been asserted, so Leibnitz sought to find a solution of the mystery. Pain is only a necessary condition for securing health, error is necessary for the discovery and progress of truth, and sin is a necessity for a world where free will or moral freedom exists.

But this solution makes God responsible for sin, and it would

be therefore wrong to punish man for what cannot be avoided. Evolution staggers when it comes to the problem of moral evil or the possibility of man's free agency. The only solution of this difficulty from the standpoint of evolution, as usually interpreted, is to deny human freedom and introduce the principle of Fate, as the ancient Stoics did, or modern pantheism, as Spinoza does.

The difficulty would not be so great if it were found that, even with the presence and operation of evil, mankind is surely working out a higher state in which all evil will be overcome, that is, if the natural workings of history were constantly tending only to a higher and better state. In that case sin and suffering would appear as merely conditions for a normal development, and the whole process would be tending constantly to a proper end. But even Professor Huxley is not able to adopt such a theory of optimism.

Let us now ask the question; Does not Christianity, the teaching of Jesus, explain the difficulty, and propound the best solution of the problem, both theoretically and practically? And that, too, without overthrowing the theory of Evolution? Evolution is right in claiming that there is a development, or evolution of man's moral, as well as his physical nature.

But we find that this evolution is disturbed, or impeded, by a new principle, viz., sin. Why not accept just here the light that Christianity throws upon this subject, that sin is a foreign principle that came in through the free will of intelligent beings, that this disturbing factor is not from God nor from nature, but, so far as our world is concerned, from man himself? Also that man in his own strength has not been able to eliminate this disturbing factor in human life, and that the only power that can do it is the power of a Divine Human Redeemer? Nay, why not go further and accept Paul's Theodicy, that finds in Christ, the God-man, the final solution of the mystery of the universe? Creation, having reached its relative completion in man, does not stop there, but reaches out through the "Last

Adam" to a higher stadium of development, a still nobler destiny in the spiritual and eternal world.

We have no doubt whatever but that even sin will finally have its solution in this higher Theodicy, when Christ shall finally deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all.

But we are passing here beyond the purpose of this article, which is to invite the reader's attention to the correspondence between the views of Professor Huxley and the teachings of Christianity. Read the paragraph on "Modern Pessimism and Optimism," and see how clearly and closely it agrees with the teachings of Jesus. There is one sentence there in regard to the "reign of peace, and lion and lamb transformation scenes," which is, no doubt, aimed against certain Chiliastic views that have prevailed in the name of Christianity, but which do not properly express the teaching of Christ.

Christ taught neither Optimism nor Pessimism, in their extreme sense, and yet He taught both conditionally. He taught the progress and the triumph of the good, but He foretold also the spread of evil. There are two kingdoms arrayed against each other in this world, the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness, and these two will go on opposing each other. Whether the one or the other shall gain most adherents depends, under God, upon the will of man. In the end the good will finally triumph, but not without a final development also of "the man of sin." What else than this is it that Professor Huxley would have us accept? Not the pessimism of modern doubt, nor yet the Optimism of Fate, but a course of history that is "very sensibly affected by human action." Just here it is that Christianity sheds its light upon the understanding of human history.

Notice also that remarkable concession: "Cosmic evolution may teach us how the good and evil tendencies of man may have come about" (this, we think, is doubtful); "but, in itself, it is incompetent to furnish any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before."

Read also what he says of the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest" as applied to man's moral nature. "I suspect that this fallacy" (of evolution) "has arisen out of the unfortunate ambiguity of the phrase 'survival of the fittest.' 'Fittest' has a connotation of 'best,' and about 'best' there hangs a moral flavor." And then see how, in the following paragraph, he goes on to describe his conception of the fittest. "In place of ruthless self-assertion it demands self-restraint; in place of thrusting aside, or treading down, all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but shall help its fellows; *its influence is directed, not so much to the survival of the fittest, as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive.*" What language, better than this closing sentence, could express the teaching of Christ!

It is our judgment that the best work in trying to reconcile Evolution and Christianity is to be performed along this line of man's ethical nature. In the sphere of natural science the theory of evolution is generally accepted, with a few slight modifications, but the difficulty is greater in the sphere of Ethics. A sound Philosophical Ethics is, in our judgment, still a desideratum. What we have to do here is to accept the truth of Evolution. There is a nature basis for the evolution of man's moral nature. Forces or laws are operative there as well as in man's physical nature. What is needed here, however, is to let the light of Christianity shine in upon the problem, not to contradict the law of Evolution, but to enable it to reach its right solution.

Unquestionably Christianity gives us the best explanation of the nature of sin as a disturbing factor in the evolution of man's Ethical nature, and also provides the power or ability to overcome this obstacle, something that no other religion has ever been able to do.

How is sin to be reconciled with Evolution? That, we grant, is a problem which has never yet been solved. The wisest and the best have struggled to explain the presence of pain and suffering in the world, and its original cause, sin. The

best solution, unquestionably, is to be found in St. Paul's Theodicy, derived from Christ. In order to apprehend this aright we must see in Christianity, not an after-thought on the part of God, consequent upon the fall of man, but a system that entered into the original plan of God in the creation of the universe. Christianity is not unnatural. The first creation in Adam and the new creation in Christ are only progressive stages in the one great design of the universe. Christ is the head of the natural as well as of the supernatural world. In Him all things are recapitulated. Sin entered as a disturbing force, not by necessity, but through the free will of the creature.

This disturbing force is eliminated by His atoning death, and His victory over death and Hades. But His person and work reach out to a far wider issue than redemption merely. In Him God and man are united, and the problem of the universe is solved.

It is a hopeful sign of the times that Christian theologians and scientists are working more and more harmoniously together. The fault for a want of harmony heretofore lies not entirely on the side of the scientists. The church has much to answer for in the way it has often treated science and scientists, as the case of Galileo attests. There are remains of narrowness and bigotry still in the churches in reference to true and sound scholarship. It is indicative of a broader and more liberal spirit that Oxford, the old Christian University of England, invites Professor Huxley, who does not believe in Christianity, to lecture in its halls.

We may yet refer to the doubtful, if not pessimistic, view Professor Huxley takes of the future, as compared with the prophecy and hope of Christianity. He says, "The theory of evolution encourages no millennial anticipations. If, for millions of years, our globe has taken the upward road, yet, sometime, the summit will be reached and the downward route will be commenced." And how melancholy the close: "We are grown men and must play the man—

Strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield,

cherishing the good that falls in our way and bearing the evil in and around us, with stout hearts set on diminishing it. So far we may all strive in one faith toward one hope:—

It may be that the gulfs will wash us down,
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
. . . . But something ere the end,
Some work of noble note may yet be done."

How far short all that is of the future which Christianity foretells when the new heavens and the new earth shall be ushered in as the completion of the struggle now going forward in our world! For, while Christianity teaches that both the good and the evil continue to develop alongside of each other, and thus sets aside a humanitarian optimism which contradicts all experience and observation, yet it speaks out in undoubted certainty as to the final result. The good will finally triumph, and a new stadium of existence be ushered in from which all sin and suffering shall be eliminated. Let the evolution theory accept this, and it then may stand. Christianity makes room for it, if we allow that its fundamental scheme enters already into the idea of creation.

True, there is one difficulty yet unexplained: we mean a future unending realm of sin and suffering, but the theory of evolution grants the mystery of evil already in this world; why not acknowledge it in a future world? Professor Huxley grants that when we come to consider man's ethical nature, the presence of good and evil, as depending on man's free choice, cannot be explained by "Cosmic Evolution." He says: "There is another fallacy which appears to me to pervade the so-called 'ethics of evolution.' It is the notion that because, on the whole, animals and plants have advanced in perfection of organization by means of the struggle for existence and the consequent 'survival of the fittest,' therefore men in society, men as ethical beings, must look to the same process to help them toward perfection."

If now the evolution theory must acknowledge a mystery in sin and misery in the world which it cannot explain, why should it not be content to acknowledge a similar mystery in their existence in the world to come? That theory at best does not find certitude at every point, it has not proved beyond doubt every stage in evolution; the "missing link" has not yet been found, yet it is received, notwithstanding this, as a *working theory*. Is there then any greater difficulty in its accepting a future existence of unending good and evil? We think not. Christian theologians themselves do not claim to be able to reconcile an eternity of suffering with reason, but the Word of God proclaims it, and so we accept it. When man finally reaches his eternal state this, as well as other mysteries, will doubtless become plainer.

Our conclusion here is, that Christianity offers the best solution of the ethical problem of man's nature, even as Professor Huxley treats the subject, and if Christianity can make room for the theory of evolution when rightly explained, and the evolution theory can make room for Christianity *when rightly explained*, a large step of progress has been made in *the harmonizing of Science and Theology*.

VI.

THE VALUE OF THE INDIVIDUAL.*

BY JUDGE W. N. ASHMAN, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I HAVE selected a very common place subject, upon which the utmost I propose to attempt, is to address a few words of common sense which may appeal to your common sense: "The Value of the Individual." The old civilizations, as you know, cared nothing for him; they wasted him in battles and they buried him by thousands alongside of the monuments which he had helped to build and which remain to us without a meaning. Once in awhile in looking back, a poet or lawgiver or soldier looms up from the darkness as the representative of a tribe or a people; but of the thousands or millions who made up the tribe or the nation we know nothing, because for them the old chroniclers cared nothing. Christianity, which is the basis of modern progress, has changed all that; it addresses itself indeed to the founding of a universal empire, yet it does not blazon the fame of the warrior, it lays down no maxim of statecraft, it formulates no policy of government, it cares nothing for the rise and fall of States. It deals only with the personal man; and its triumphs are written in the lives of individuals. Other ages may have surpassed ours in achievements which lend an air of romance to history; but ours is an age whose activities concentrate upon man as the unit; an age on whose plane of thought there are few mountain peaks, because what was once the valley has become the table land. The law of modern progress begins and ends with the individual; it

* An Address delivered before the Literary Societies of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., June 13, 1893.

contents itself with making him the leaven, which, in its turn, will infallibly leaven the whole mass.

I can imagine no higher nor grander conception than this ideal to which modern progress founded on Christianity points. When inspiration speaks of man as having been created a little lower than the angels, it does not speak of him in the abstract, as a sort of poetic myth typifying a poetic race: a vague sort of primeval man. It means the every-day man, whom you pass on the streets and sit with on 'change; the artisan and the philosopher, the toiler and the thinker; it means you and me. It was for these men and such as these that God rounded the world into beauty; it was for them that He traced the courses of the rivers and moulded and painted the valley and hill, and filled with a very plenitude of delights the home of man. He meant, and modern progress means, that man, the individual, so long as he labors for the common weal, shall have some share in the glories and riches which are heaped around him in this measureless profusion. And I have some sympathy for the Socialist, misguided as he is, who rebels against the social order which denies him the good, to which in his vague way he feels he has a title.

Because, after all, how many steps have we taken in our so-called Progress. Our government, it is true, is built upon the theory of the value of the individual. Our Declaration of Independence and our bill of rights and our Constitution are filled with magnificent platitudes (if these words are consistent) about the inalienable rights of the individual. But these constitute at best only a sort of paper currency with precious little specie behind it. Of what use is it to tell a man that he is possessed of the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, when he is out of employment and is dying with hunger? Of course he is entitled; but so is the patient in the last agonies of cholera; the task of securing these rights is about as hopeless in one case as in the other. Why, at the very time when this splendid truism respecting inalienable rights was written, a whole race within our borders was practically denied

every one of these rights. The day of slavery, it is true, has set, but the day of actual freedom has only begun to dawn. I aver that one-half of our teeming population do *not* enjoy the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I know it is fashionable to say that in this favored land, the rich and the poor stand on a dead level. It is not true, and you know that it is a falsehood. Sometimes, yes, often, the poor man's son asserts the sovereignty of his manhood and rises to the heights of power—but how does he do it? By hard and strenuous striving; by days of drudgery and nights of study; by giving up the joys of youth; by self-sacrifice; by conflicts which dull the edge of his finer sensibilities. If this boasted law of equality is very much more than a myth, how comes it that one man can wield in life, and will, at his discretion, at death, the awful sum of seventy millions of dollars, without the shadow of an obligation under any human statute, or any human custom, to bestow one cent of his unused wealth upon the starving neighbor beside him? The law of equality is written in our Constitution and in our statutes, but for all that it has never as yet, adjusted on a rational basis the relations which should obtain between capital and labor. In spite of its utterances one-half of the population of every city, if some sudden disease should overtake them, would not know where another meal would come from. We have churches for the poor and rich alike; but two-thirds of that same population could not worship in them if they wanted to—as they do not—because there would be no room. We have hospitals for the sick, but thousands die unattended and uncared for, whom human skill and tenderness could heal. We have prisons from which the prisoner emerges more steeped in iniquity than when he entered them. I walk through the narrow lanes of the city, and in many a corner and hovel, all hidden and unheard, I note the poverty which broods over a joyless past and looks out upon a hopeless future; and yet right beyond me are the stately avenues on which wealth builds its palaces and the docks where it unloads its shipping; and I know that one-

tenth of its abundance would suffice, to bring to these plague spots of desolation health and peace and rejoicing. We have not yet begun fairly to estimate the value of the Individual. Every man whom poverty or ignorance or neglect robs of his power, is so much capital disused and rusted and destroyed. Imagine a banking institution doing business upon the scheme of investing one-fourth of its funds, and allowing the other three-fourths to be untouched in its vaults. Yet that is precisely the policy which modern social economy has adopted. Until within the lifetime of the very youngest person before me, it has practically counted woman out as a possible factor in the work of civilization. She is disfranchized; she is not permitted a voice in the selection of the men who are to rule her, nor in the making of the laws which are to secure or to confiscate her property. Indeed, until very recently, the only female whom the law, in its benignity, regarded as of sane mind was an old maid; it did allow her the privilege of managing her own property, where she had any, and the still greater blessing of being sued for her debts, when she neglected to pay them. When she emerged from this chrysalis state into the butterfly realms of matrimony, the law at once assumed, and perhaps with some reason, that she had become an idiot. If she bought a hat or an umbrella her husband was forced to pay for them, apparently because he alone and not she could know whether they matched her complexion; if she slandered her neighbor her husband was forced to pay the damages assessed by the jury, or to go to prison, in default of payment. If she earned any money by taking in washing, or by writing for the magazines, her husband could lawfully steal it from her. And some of the judges of our courts are now going into spasms because the Legislature of Pennsylvania has declared that a married woman shall actually be bound by her own contract. To put the thought into a sentence: Society is a reckless spendthrift. With a limitless army of toilers it relegates whole battalions of them into inaction; with boundless supplies of wealth it panders to the luxury of the few, and

allows the many to starve. In the high Court of Conscience Society must be adjudged a bankrupt.

You must not ascribe these deficiencies to the want of suitable apparatus for carrying on the work of the age. A mistake like that would be a slander upon the American name. We are a nation of inventors, and we surpass the ancients, among other things, in having introduced the science of Mechanics into the domain of Philanthropy. We have machines to relieve men of all ills; machines to make them good, and machines to carry them to heaven. In the play of this etherial mechanism, everything in our economy, moves automatically, like the puppets in a Punch and Judy Show. Mr. Drummond has written an ingenious book entitled "Natural Laws in the Spiritual World;" our modern philosophers have reversed the order, and have introduced a variety of spiritual machinery into the natural world. The old but Divine injunction was to visit the fatherless in his affliction, and by personal contact to relieve personal distress; and the good that came thence was as great a boon to the giver as to the recipient. But that was a slow and cumbrous method, and you do it now by machinery; you invest in the stock, so to speak, of a Soup Society, or an Ice Water Fountain for the Poor Society, in the hope of securing a dividend in the next world; or to be more exact in the metaphor, you drop your money in the slot, and take out a ticket to Paradise. The curious thing about it is that the factory which turns out the largest number of spiritual implements is the Legislature. There is not a single good in the long catalogue of human hopes, which that workshop does not offer to manufacture, nor a single evil for which it has not a machine ready to your hand. Do you want to stop drunkenness; it is the easiest thing in the world; get an act of Assembly licensing the liquor traffic. Do you want to make men reverence the Sabbath; that is easy too; get an act closing candy shops on Sunday. Do you want to civilize boot blacks; get a charter for the Young Men's Evangelical Home. Do not misunderstand me. I am not denouncing machinery; on the contrary I believe you cannot have too

many soup societies, Dorcas societies, sick diet kitchens, flower missions, breakfast associations, bands of mercy, bands of charity and bands of hope; Temporary Homes for Young Men and Permanent Homes for Old Men; Homes for Decayed Widows and Parlors for Pious Young Women. I am glad to know that when a mechanic is old he is supposed to be cared for in the Suburban Retreat for Mechanics; that when a school teacher gives up teaching she is supposed to draw a pension; that when a minister is superannuated he may enter the rest for aged clergymen; and that when a lawyer ceases to earn fees, he may luxuriate in the almshouse. I believe in all these instrumentalities; but what I object to is that we entrust to machinery the work which requires to be done by the individual; work in which the individual conscience of the doer acts upon the individual conscience of the beneficiary. No remedial statute can manufacture morality out of vice; and you cannot legislate men into virtue, any more than they can drift into heaven.

We place the same absolute reliance upon machinery in our political system: just as soon as we have provided ourselves with the proper political apparatus, our duty as citizens ends. A great many of us do not even undertake to oil the levers, by using our ballots; we let the engine run itself. When we condescend to cast a vote, we do not always stop to inquire the name of the man we vote for. It is enough for us that an office has been created; the incumbent who fills it is merely a part of the machine.

It follows that many of our political contrivances are like the locomotive built by the Chinaman, which was a very pretty piece of workmanship, but it would not go because the boiler was solid. Just think of what a magnificent system of checks and balances, of forces and counter forces, we are possessed—on paper. We have a President who watches the Senate, a Senate which watches the house, and a Supreme Court which watches all three. We have two great political parties, each of which is constantly using its best endeavors to save the country from being ruined by the other political party. Then think of our

municipal organisms; of them at least, we may say with the Psalmist, that they are fearfully and wonderfully made. A New England woman was asked if she thought Heaven was preferable to Boston. She replied that she did think so at one time, but that Boston had improved immensely in the last twenty years. Well, we who are of Philadelphia, are like the people of Boston; we prefer our own to any celestial city. Our political conscience is regulated by ordinances, and our political duties are performed by departments. We have a department of gas, and a department of water; a department of police and a department of Public Safety and a department of law. We have any number of bureaus: bureaus of highways, bureaus of public education, bureaus of police, bureaus of charities; and we have two chambers of councils. Even the brute creation goes through a bureau; no fish can swim in our rivers, without being supervised by the Fish Commission. If machinery is to save us, our political salvation is assured. And yet we suffer sometimes. Our gas burns as if it was made of water, and our water tastes as if it was made of gas, and the only things which we get from the two departments with unfailing exactitude are the bills. We make a clean gift of our streets to Passenger Railway Companies; and in return the benevolent Presidents of those corporations furnish us with cars, which we can only use when we have leisure, because when we are in a hurry we walk.

But the trouble is that mere machinery in this field will not answer. It is an old thing and has been tried too often. I have little doubt that Sodom and Gomorrah had each of them a mayor and two sets of councils; but these agents did not save them, and some people would be malicious enough to say that they even expedited the ruin of these unfortunate towns. No matter what may be your appliances, you cannot, I repeat it, manufacture morality out of vice, and cannot legislate men into virtue. If society is to be reorganized and lifted to a higher level, the only lever for the purpose will be the reorganization of the individual. It is the whole law of experience and of inspiration. And if you hope to leave the world a little better than

you first found it, the only machine you can depend upon is yourself. The law of progress, as true of you as of society, is that all growth comes from within. No external agency can generate growth—neither school nor college nor church; they may give direction to growth, but they cannot originate the miracle. I am not slandering the noble institution within whose doors I am, when I say that the scholar may be crammed with learning; he may be able to map the courses of the stars, and to sound the deepest depths of philosophy,—and yet for all that, his nature may be as stunted as that of a South Sea Islander. It is possible to pump a man so full of information, as to leave no room for the play of his brain. Of what use to the business man is his knowledge of the dates of the Peloponnesian and Punic wars, if he has overlooked the date at which his own note matured at the bank? Young men come to the bar, just as they enter other professions, at the age of twenty-five, whose whole life up to that point, has been passed in the academy, the college and the law school, and who are dictionaries on legs, of legal definitions; yet they can no more impress themselves upon the common sense of a jury than they can build a common sewer. A stable keeper once boasted that he fed his patrons' horses so well, that many of them died from blind staggers. Some of our schools act on that principle; they feed so many facts to the brain, that thought is foundered. We forget in our systems of training, that what comes to the intellect from without, is accretion, is accident, like the soil which fastens on the rock and increases its bulk; we forget that the living thing—the tree which springs from the seed, the man who develops from the infant—grows only from within.

And so I repeat—and I cannot repeat it too often—at the very bottom of all advancement,—as its very ultimate factor,—stands the Individual. Wrapped up in his destiny is the destiny of the State. It is not to the Senate, nor to the army, nor to the navy—not to any political mechanism whatever, no matter how cunningly devised, that we must look for safety. Our hope lies in the individual—the boy in the school and the graduate

of the college. And to you who are about to enter the world of action, and you who have already stepped into its arena, the controlling question is, How are you fitted for the work? You are not to discard machinery, but in the last analysis, as I have said, the only mechanism upon which you can rely, is yourself. And the grand, absorbing fact which you are to know, is yourself. I am not speaking now of self-knowledge, in the sense in which it is commonly understood—an acquaintance with one's capacities and failings. I mean something different; an acquaintance with your own personality. If to-night, I might utter a wish which should carry in its train every conceivable blessing, it would be that some miraculously-gifted seer should come into this presence; should walk up and down these passages; should take each man by the hand, and should introduce him to himself. Life would be rehabilitated,—society would be reconstructed,—the individual would stand forth in his just proportions,—if each man could see himself in his own personality, and could see his neighbor as he actually is.

A boy once came to his teacher and showed him a knife, and said: Teacher, my father on last Christmas, gave me a penknife; sometimes I think this knife is the one he gave me, and sometimes I think it is not; and I want you to tell me whether it is the knife or not. It is just this way, teacher. The knife my father gave me had two blades; one day by accident I broke one blade, and the cutler put in a new one exactly like the first. Then I broke the second blade, and a new one, its very counterpart, was made by the same cutler, and finally a wagon wheel crushed the handle of the knife to pieces, and I ordered a new handle just like the original. So the new knife is the very picture of the knife which was given me, even down to the plate which has my name on it, and yet there is not a particle in it which was in the knife my father gave me. Now I leave you to solve the puzzle while I submit to you a more personal riddle. Physicians tell us that in every period of ten years a man's system is absolutely renewed; so that no particle of bone or flesh or fibre which entered into its organism at

the beginning remained in it at the close. The question then is, Are you the same identities you were ten years ago? The thought may have its humorous side. A legacy is left to you to-day, and ten years hereafter your testator dies, and you apply to his executors for its payment. Will you be satisfied to be told that the person of your name to whom the gift was made, cannot be the same person as the one who demands its payment, because every part of the legatee of ten years ago has disappeared, and has been replaced by new material. What would be your answer when called upon to establish your identity with that of the old-time legatee? What indeed could it be but that your thought assured you of the oneness of the two beings? A philosopher might make a more finished answer—he could not make one more philosophically true. Your thoughts were not simply yours—they were you, yourself,—and beside this supreme fact of your consciousness you cared nothing for the material structure in which they were born. It will be worth while to elaborate this distinction. You visit some great locomotive works and gaze with somewhat of awe upon the finished specimens of speed and power before you. The honest workman, proud of these trophies of his skill, points to implements which are scattered about—the hammer and plane, the drill and the lathe, and says, "These are the instruments which built those engines." You look with something of pity at the man, and say: "Why these tools did not make the locomotives. They would have lain rusting on the floor and on their bases, if some force had not moved them. It was your strong arms and those of your fellow-workmen which wielded the tools —it was these which built the engines." And yet were you not as mistaken as was the workman. Would not his arms have hung as dead and powerless at his side as the instruments around you, if some force from without or from within had not moved them? What force impelled those limbs into activity, but Thought? It was not the tools nor the arms and hands of the laborers; it was Thought, which built the locomotives. I will go further. Before a single beam was laid or a rod or

lever fashioned for that giant mechanism, the locomotive, finished in all its exquisite symmetry of detail, stood complete in the thought of its projector. And so all that lives and moves and exists once lived only in the domain of Thought. Before an iron rail was laid or Stephenson had harnessed vapor, viewless engines flashed through mountain tunnels and over bridges which spanned rivers that were never dotted upon maps; before Guttenberg had built his printing press, airy types lay in unseen cases, and printed pages were flung from noiseless cylinders; before Michael Angelo had rounded the dome of St. Peter's or Wren had laid the corner-stone of St. Paul's, the towers and turrets of temples which no hand had fashioned, rose above spacious avenues; and faces sweeter than those of Titian's angels, long before he had put his pencil to the canvas, looked down from the walls of untrodden galleries. Men forget this primal law of their being, and they fail to achieve the purpose of their life, because they are actually unacquainted with themselves. They forget that their bodies are no more a part of their personality than the houses in which they live or the clothes which they wear; that these are mere accidents from which at any moment they may be freed, without losing a particle of their own identity. What, for instance, am I doing at this time—looking down upon an assemblage of persons, every one of whom is distinguished from every other by some peculiarity of form, look, manner, and every one of whom is known to his fellows by this peculiarity. And yet I do not see you, your very self. I see only the accidents which conceal you. To see you, I must go beneath these surroundings; away down through the mysterious chambers of the brain, into the deeper recesses of the soul; and there, in that awful solitude which no eye but one has ever pierced, and whose stillness has been broken by no sound,—there and there only, shall I find you—that actual self—the ego of philosophy. Thought then, which constitutes your personality, is the motive power from whose exercise your progress, if you shall make any, must come. You will be, not

what wealth or social position or political fortune—but what your thought, shall make you. Your motive force, your creative energy, your destiny for good or for evil,—all lie wrapped up in your thought. A single thought has opened up a new era in history. For centuries men had seen fruit falling ripened to the ground; Newton had seen it a hundred times, but one day he saw an apple fall, and he asked himself the question, Why it fell. In the thought which answered that question, was born the knowledge of the law which governs the movement of the spheres. I can take another and a loftier example. Nineteen centuries ago, a divine man dreamed a dream, if you will, of universal empire. He resolved to build a temple in which all men should worship; to found a city which should outstand the ravages of time; to erect a dynasty to which kings should bow.

Where, you ask me, were the treasures with which he was to fashion these monuments, and where were the armies which he was to lead to victory? Why, he had but a single implement, and it was a thought; the thought of man's duty to man and his duty to God. With this thought he wrought for three short years, and died the death of a criminal. And now, after the lapse of all these years, when I venture to recall his name, do you say to me, what a stupendous failure was his? But was it? Why to-day I sail to a foreign shore, and as I come in sight of its headlands, the thought comes over me that not one in all the teeming millions who people that land, ever heard of my name or knows of my existence. I am to them all, a stranger and an alien. Yet all along its coasts, I see the lights which were kindled to warn me off from a dangerous shoal or a hidden reef; and I ask this question: Why did these men lavish these resources of skill and sympathy upon a foreigner who might also be an enemy? The answer comes: It was because of the thought which that man had uttered: the thought of man's duty to God and of his duty to man. Or I walk through the crowded wards of the hospital, and I see the little waif from the city's streets nursed with as tender a solicitude, and tended

with all the skill a rich man's gold could purchase, and I ask what benign influence has thus worked upon the hearts of men? Again the answer comes: It is the thought which has come down to us through the centuries,—the thought of man's duty to God and of his duty to man. And so wherever I go—in the streets of great capitals, and in the quiet paths of the country; in churches and libraries and museums; in hospitals and in homes; on the docks where ships are loading, wherever men meet in brotherhood and wherever good deeds are done, I hear the same answer, that all this is the outcome of that thought of the Nazarene—the thought of man's duty to God and of his duty to man.

Once get this truth fairly acknowledged that a man's personality resides in his thought, and how many conventional prejudices and fallacies will be dissipated. The best of us now judge our fellow-man in a half-dazed sort of way; the person is so covered up by traditional trappings that we scarcely see him at all, and we take off our hats not to him, but to his social position, his glittering wealth or his eminent respectability. Love and pity and high courage may look out of the eyes of the laboring man, but because his hands are horny and his dress is soiled, we pass him by without recognition. We are rather fond than otherwise of shams. We find it convenient to have different words for the same thing. The man who takes your bread out of your mouth by watering the stock whose dividends made up your income, is a financier; and the man who steals a doughnut is a thief. One of them sails in a steam yacht, and the other rides in a police van. Respectable shams, from whom all manhood has long ago evaporated, pose in a mild way as reformers. In the days of the Rebellion these men joined the Union League, because it was fashionable to be patriotic, and because there was some danger, if they remained outside, that they might swing from a lamp-post; and they became ardent opponents of slavery, as soon as it was an established fact that slavery was dead. Young man, if you want to be serene, if you want to shun responsibility, if you want to be safe—be a

trimmer. You will have a pleasant life even if it is a mean one, and you will escape censure by having no convictions.

Out of this misty atmosphere, however, we catch at times glimpses of a hero in a quarter where we did not look for him. To-night, for aught I know, not one hundred feet from this building, up some narrow back street, in a mean, uncurtained room, a woman sits sewing for the scanty pittance which is to keep her and her child from hunger. She is so poor that no one knows her name, and men and women as they pass her on the highway, give her no word of greeting, and no thought except perhaps, of pity. Yet she is doing, it may be, a work which you or I might envy. Forth from that room, and sustained by her prayers, her boy shall yet go to fight his rough way through the world—to meet the scorn of proud men and the insolence of rich men, and the temptations of bad men—to conquer, and to become the inventor, the poet or the leader of his time. Or I stand at the railway station and watch the engineer, as with rough garb and grimy face, he looks back upon the long train, filled with wealth and fashion; with bankers and merchants and statesmen; with women delicately appareled and fresh from luxurious homes. How that mean workman dwindles in the contrast! But an hour later, the man looks out of the rushing window of his cab, and sees death just ahead of him in its most appalling shape. One moment is left him—let him jump before the crash comes. Does he do it? With a steady hand on the throttle, with an awful pull at the brakes, he checks the momentum of the train, and dies a mangled victim in the wreck; dies as true a hero as the soldier who wins a battle or marches with a forlorn hope.

In the application of this principle, we shall outgrow the popular notion of what constitutes dignity, and which draws a sharp distinction between the elegance of leisure and the vulgarity of work, and elevates the professions above the trades. Some of us perhaps have a lurking belief that the trade of a mechanic is not exactly respectable. We skip over that part of our Bibles which tells us that one of the apostles was a tent-

maker, and that several were fishermen; and we hate to think that the individual among them who was, modernly speaking, the only truly respectable one,—because he was treasurer and carried the bag—was Judas Iscariot. If that gentleman belonged to this era, he would be eminently respectable, and would be probably living respectably, along with a number of other treasurers, in Brazil or in Canada. For several reasons, it will be prudent to pause before condemning the workman and his calling as vulgar. One is the Divine command: "Thou shalt eat thy bread in the sweat of thy face." The luxurious man may elude that injunction for a time, but it is tolerably certain that the people who don't sweat in this world, will sweat in the next. Another reason is that in the vicissitudes of fortune, the wealthy man of to-day is often the son of a mechanic, and that his own son will be a mechanic, or something much worse. My own thought is that there is very much in the life of the artisan to be envied. He has more time than the successful and, therefore, hard-worked professional man, for recreation and study. John Bunyan was a peddler of tin kettles, but he found leisure, and he had the ability to write a world-renowned book. Roger Sherman was a shoemaker, and he was also a signer of the Declaration of Independence. But I have worked the whole problem out in figures. You will agree with me that very few laboring men work on an average 10½ hours a day. I know that plumbers do not. But suppose they do; their actual time of labor in that case will amount to 169 days of 24 hours each, in one year. They will then have 196 days to themselves, to be devoted to eating, sleeping and other purposes exclusively their own. Now take the case of a mechanic who has reached the age of 70 years. If you allow him 8 hours each day, for sleep, he will have slept 23 years and 4 months. There is nearly a quarter of a century in which he did no work, and cannot be said to have suffered. Limit him to 3 meals each day, with a half-hour for each meal; it has taken him just 3723 days (I mean working days of 10 hours a piece) to eat them. A good appetite will have ensured him a

meal in the aggregate which took about five years to consume. Observe that I have deducted from this table the first two years of his life, because during those years he was eating nearly all the time. If you also allow the man his Sundays and 4 hours of leisure in his evenings, you will find that his holidays (counting each as you count a working day, at 10 hours) amount to 18,956 days. His actual working days, in his life of 70 years, would number 27,000 of 10 hours each, which would be equal to 9590 full days, or about 26 years in all. But in this last calculation, I have assumed that the man worked 10½ hours a day, commencing with the day of his birth, and ending with the hour of his death, but the most laborious toiler never did that.

The acceptance of this principle will rid us of another delusion. One parable in Scripture has been worse confounded than anything else which was ever written,—the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Thousands have gathered from that story the falsehood, that the only plea which they shall need before the Infinite Judge will be the plea of poverty; they were too poor and humble to be responsible. But what will be the answer, "You left your poverty, as the rich man left his wealth, behind you; at this tribunal neither wealth nor poverty is recognized. You were poor! but you were given a body, strong and active and supple; what did you do with that? Did you wield your strength to gather the fruits of an honest industry, or did you weaken it by idleness, or squander it by dissipation? You were given a brain, curious and complicated and priceless,—what did you do with that? Did you weave from it the scheme which was to ennoble your lot and bring hope to your neighbor? You were given a soul, in whose mysterious chambers great thoughts were to be born—thoughts which would reach out to the infinite; what did you do with that?" I tell you it will go hard with the poor man, if he fears to answer these questions.

I think that the subject which I have discussed in my rude way is a momentous one. It involves the problem of the con-

tinuance of our republic. In spite of Fourth of July orations and Centennial Expositions, our institutions have not yet fairly emerged from the stages of experiment. Older civilizations outnumbered our life by centuries, but they were buried at last. What element, except the one which I have named, promises to perpetuate our nationality? Immersed in the activities of an age which knows no rest, we are apt to associate power only with what is tangible, and to forget that the real forces of nature are beneath the surface and unseen. We gaze at the express train as it whirls past us at the speed of fifty miles an hour, and we say to ourselves, what a mighty exhibition of energy is here! We forget that at that very moment and all about us, great forces are at play, compared with which that spectacle of man's might, sinks into insignificance. What are they, do you ask? They are the laws of attraction and gravitation, which guide the planets in their courses, and control the movements of the suns, and whose awful levers work through infinite space. No eye can follow the line through which their orbits run, and no ear can detect a sound of their majestic workings, for they move in the stillness wherewith Omnipotence works. It is just so in the world of men. The real forces which control society are not noticed in the newspapers nor heralded on platforms; they do not emanate from the Senate; they don't reside in the army; they are born in the home, and they are evolved by the individual. You, young man of the present, in whose thought centres a high ideal of duty, and to whom all else—the pride of birth and wealth and praise—are accidents, you sway the destinies of the Republic.

I stood one day in a bare room, and watched a man who sat in front of a canvas. He was a painter, and he had drawn a few rough lines upon its surface, and had put here and there a few rough bits of color, which gave, however, no clue to his meaning. But a year afterwards, I stood in a long gallery in a spacious building, lined with pictures and statues, and filled with men and women. A great crowd stood awe-struck before a single painting, and I did not wonder that they did. It was a

noble picture of a sea coast in New England. The greenish waves were striking against the rocks and rolling off in long lines of silver along the beach; the white spray was jeweled in the sunlight; and the soft haze of summer was just wrapping a ship which lay far out on the ocean. It seemed to me that I could almost hear the waves as they broke, and feel the breeze as it swept the sands. I looked at the name below the painting, and it was the name of the painter of a year ago, and this was the picture on which he had been working. Each of you is painting a picture, which will be seen some day by a vast assembly; it is the picture of your life. How will you paint it? Shall it be in dark and lurid colors, showing only the tempest and shipwreck; or shall it glow with a serene beauty that shall typify a noble life? Sometime to-day look at that picture; you cannot rub out a single line that you have put in it; but the canvas is still before you, and the work is unfinished. Paint the rest of it well. It is the best prayer I can utter, as I bid you God speed and farewell.

VII.

THE BENEFITS OF TRUE SKEPTICISM.*

BY C. A. LITTLE, ESQ., HAGERSTOWN, MD.

THE subject to which we invite your attention is the "Benefits of True Skepticism;" and while its is not our aim to encourage skepticism, according to the common acceptance of the term, we yet hope to show in the course of our remarks that from honest skepticism has come much good, and that even skepticism not so good in itself has indirectly been beneficial.

Whether we accept the Biblical account of the origin of man, and the first peopling of the earth, literally, as believed by the majority of civilized human beings, or whether we believe in the modern theory of evolution, as now advocated by many of our most learned scholars and Christian teachers, it matters not. We are certain that the original man was not a being of the very highest order as compared with the man of to-day. We know that in the early ages of the world's history, the black clouds of ignorance and superstition hung over the world like a dark mantle, shutting out almost entirely the light of intelligence and truth. In his habits, and habitations, customs and every day life man stood only a step above the beast of the field whose companion, though master, he was, but he was endowed with great capabilities, and within him was implanted a spirit that would not allow him to remain in this state long. He soon began to develop and evolve, and ere long started out in pursuit of knowledge, putting in motion the onward march of human intellect, that has continued unceasingly from that day to this, and that will continue until the end of time.

*An address delivered before the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., on Wednesday evening, June 14, 1893.

His first fight was, of course, with the material world surrounding him, and which was, as it were, his heritage with which to begin life. This had to be subdued, so to speak, and made to contribute to his wants and comforts. The virgin forests had to be cleared with the rude implements his inventive genius, poor as it was, suggested; flocks had to be reared and cared for, and all those necessaries, which his physical, material life demanded, had to be seen to. In short, his life was one hard battle against nature and her severities, and his own existence depended upon the question whether he should subdue her or be overcome by her. That he did subdue her the survival of man testifies. That he did it well is amply proven by the history of civilization and the perpetuation of the human race, rising as it did from century to century, to higher planes of action and to nobler and greater deeds.

This sort of life, of course, tended to develop only one side of man's intellect, namely, that sort of intelligence which enabled him to perform the physical labors that constantly confronted him, and to invent and put into use the best methods for accomplishing these ends. A better way of doing a certain thing than the method in use prior to that time, reasoned out, or discovered by accident and then adopted, marked one step of advance and progress in his condition and helped to lay the foundation for the enormous strides he was destined to make in future generations. All this, however, resulted in the development of force and physical strength rather than in mental culture, and in that sort of culture, which we now look upon as the natural outcome of a superior intelligence.

But man could not stop here, he could not be hemmed in by the narrow confines of the material world, and soon his mental faculties, impelled by the innate desire for knowledge, implanted in man's heart from the beginning, began to take wings, as it were, and soar away from the material things around him and to inquire into causes that produced certain results. The inquiry once started could not be stopped until it had solved the problem. Many experiences of the same sort established cer-

tain fixed facts, observations of different effects and the solution of their causes led to comparisons and soon set man to putting into action those reasoning faculties with which he was endowed but which seemed up to this time to be lying dormant. Onward and onward he went adding to his store of knowledge from generation to generation, handing it down from father to son and hoarding it up as a rich treasure to be bequeathed to the future race. The progress was slow but sure. At one time it advanced rapidly under propitious auspices; at other times it was retarded and almost overcome by the prevailing ignorance of the times. Just as the physical man had to battle and fight for physical existence, so the intellectual man had to wage war for recognition, and for the establishment of what he deemed to be true and right. After centuries of struggle and strife only, came the full dawn of the intellectual day, dispelling the mists of the long dark night of ignorance, and making the world appear as new born under the refulgent light of established truth.

Since then the progress has been rapid—simply the advance of a victorious army after the first line of fortifications had been captured. Soon man ceased to be only a tiller of the soil and a hewer of wood, and the attainment of wisdom became one of his pursuits. The realms of philosophy were invaded by him, and he took the greatest pleasure in working out the principles underlying human actions. Science became his handmaiden, ready to do his service, and ere long the profoundest secrets of nature that at one time appeared to him to be unfathomable became known to him and turned to use by him. Forces, that ere this, were supposed to be controlled by his Creator alone, became subject to his bidding, and were from time to time called into action by man and their power made to contribute to his comforts and conveniences. Nor did he stop here. Not satisfied with those things that were simply useful, and that contributed to his necessary wants, he by the cultivation of the genius within him, and inspired by a love of that which appealed to the æsthetic side of his being, branched forth

into the realms of the beautiful, and there made manifest in the great achievements of genius his power in that particular sphere. Art became to him a necessity, and revelling in the sweet sounds of her soul inspiring music or held spell-bound by the works of her great masters in the realm of literature, he continued to move forward and onward toward the goal, which the Creator intended should be his final destination.

In addition to all this, there is still another side of man's life to which we desire to refer here and without which his life, no matter how great his achievements, no matter how sublime his thoughts and instincts, will be a total failure. I mean the religious side of man, and in that too there has from the beginning been a constant growth and advancement, but this was different in character from the growth and advancement on the material or physical side of his life. There he had to make the start himself, and work from one plane to another by virtue of his own strength, while on his religious side there was help from without. He was created a religious being, and he could never, no matter how hard he tried, get away from the religious principles put into him, any more than he could get away from his own identity. True, he did not always hold to the true religion. Paganism, heathenism and idolatry frequently did battle with him, and for long periods of the world's history seemed to have almost subjugated him and made him their slave. Indeed we might say that the great conflicts of the ancient world were waged in behalf of these different religions. The strife was long and bloody; but in the end the true and only religion for man's salvation triumphed as it was decreed should happen, and the world to-day in addition to the boasts she can make with reference to her material progress and with reference to her temporal wants, can thank her Creator that she now enjoys the glorious blessings of Christianity and lives in the fond hope of a happy future life to come.

Why all this? you ask. We answer, that in this long history of the World's development, in this long story of the World's fight for knowledge and truth in all departments, is

where the benefits of skepticism have been felt and where they become apparent. Something had to be known before it could be doubted, there had to be something on which the skeptic could work.

What do we mean by True Skepticism? Certainly not such skepticism, as was taught by the ancients, who doubted all things, who believed that truth was unattainable, and who therefore gave up the pursuit of it. Not that "universal doubt or at least doubt with regard to the validity of all judgments respecting that which lies beyond the range of experience," as expressed by Ueberweg, nor that sort of skepticism as summed up by one of the ancient skeptics in the three following propositions: 1. "Nothing exists. 2. If anything existed it would be unknowable. 3. If anything existed and were knowable, the knowledge of it could not be communicated." We certainly could not subscribe to the teachings of those who were in ancient times considered as belonging to the School of Skeptics, nor do we subscribe to the teachings of even many Modern Skeptics, so called. What we mean by skepticism for the purpose of this discourse is what the word itself, taken in its fundamental form and according to the original word from which it is derived, means. According to that definition the skeptic is one who *doubts, hesitates* and considers. One who is so careful in his observations, as indicated by the word itself, that he puts his hands over his eyes to shade them in order that he may direct his sight upon the object he is viewing without danger of any interference from the outside. In short, one who does not take anything for granted, one who investigates for himself, who pries into things and tries to get to the bottom of them, and one who when his investigations convince him that the generally accepted theories with reference to the things investigated are wrong, has the courage of his convictions and is willing to stand up in the face of the world in behalf of them. Skeptics of the former class, doubters who doubted simply for the sake of doubting, many of whom went even so far as to doubt their own doubts, have existed for a comparatively short

time, while the latter, men who doubted only when they for some reason feared that they had not attained the truth have been at work from the beginning of time, and to them we are indebted for the many changes that took place from time to time in the world's history and that led to progress and improvement. It has been their province or mission to overthrow that which was old and that which they demonstrated was false and to establish in its stead that which was new and true, or which they at the time believed to be true. It can easily be seen of what immense service men of this sort have been to the world and are to it to-day and how much we owe to this sort of skepticism for our condition at this time.

That theirs was no easy task must be admitted, and if we were disposed to doubt it, the history of the world would attest in no uncertain sound the truthfulness of the proposition, and the blood of many martyrs would bear testimony in its behalf.

In describing as we have endeavored to do, the various stages through which the world passed in its development and progress, we did not intend to convey the idea that the work went on uninterruptedly, that it was started in the right channel from the beginning, that truth was attained as soon as sought after and that all theories advanced, although honestly, were true. Far from it, man was not a perfect creature, not a god, who knew it all. His advances were experimental to a great degree, and many times what seemed to be an established truth, and what had stood the test of centuries according to the lights of that period, was ruthlessly upturned by some one who had at first doubted the supposed truth, whose doubts led to long and careful investigation, and whose investigations led to conviction of the falsity of the theory. These intellectual cataclysms were at times so radical and sweeping in their effect that we cannot wonder that at times the earth seemed to be shaken almost to its very center, and the overthrow of the entire social fabric seemed imminent.

To properly appreciate this it might be well to take a glance at man himself and the character of his mental operations. We

rarely stop to think what sort of creatures we are and have been. We are gregarious, fond of company, fond of society; we want to be with some of our own class. We think alike in a measure, and usually our thoughts are controlled by some one, whom we look upon as our superior. Just as the savage to-day bows down literally to his chief and leader, so we figuratively recognize in many of our leaders the fountain of what is right. As the savage almost allows his chieftain to think for him, so we, many of us, without being aware of it, allow others to mould our thoughts for us. Take, for example some scientific school, that teaches what it conceives to be scientific truth: how many of the students of that particular school ever get away from the teachings of that school? how many of the students of that school ever advance theories different from those advanced by the said school? Take another example, which will perhaps more fully illustrate the point I desire to make just here. How many students of theology ever get away from the doctrines taught in their particular seminary? Those attending a Presbyterian Seminary cling to the teachings of Calvin as handed down from generation to generation. Those in a Lutheran School stand by the dogmas of their Church, and the students of a Reformed School and a Reformed Seminary in the majority of cases stand up for the doctrines which they have been taught. Who control the teachings of these respective schools? I answer, a few men, in many instances one man. I do not mean to argue that this should be different. True in some cases there may be room for improvement in what we now hear spoken of as the non-essentials, although we cannot find any fault with the fundamental doctrines, and the essential teachings of these different institutions referred to. Could we not, let me ask, select to-day a dozen men who control in a great measure the theological trend of the times? could we not, select a dozen men who control the scientific world of to-day? Not like kings do they sit upon thrones wielding sceptres of power, but wherever we look, wherever we turn, we see the effects of their influence and the result of their teachings. Men are dependent creatures;

they are so by nature and love to follow some one else; and to them "follow the leader" is an almost universal law. This has been going on from time immemorial in every department of learning, and the only way that changes could be effected was by revolutions in thought brought on by the influence of some master mind that had at times power to break away from the general current and to start out upon new lines, upon newly discovered principles. The men who did this were men different from the ordinary crowd. Men of strong bold minds—men of great courage—men of genius. To them the world is indebted for its high state of civilization to-day. Had it not been for them the march of improvement would have gone on in the same channel in which it was started. There would have been no changes and consequently no improvement. The world would have been dull, dreary and monotonous and we very little better than savages. They were actuated by noble purposes and impelled by the new impulses given them by the novelty of their newly discovered ideas. The untrodden paths in the great field of learning were pleasant to them and lured them on to further investigation, and just as the lover of nature is never happier than when exploring some new region, than when climbing the mountain cliffs where he feels human foot has never been before, or when he penetrates some dense forest, so the searcher after truth never feels happier than when exploring the hitherto unknown regions and bringing to light truths before unknown.

For the natural tendency of men to follow each other referred to before, there must be some deep hidden reason. No two persons are alike. No two persons act alike, and no two persons look alike; but what strong resemblances we find at times between people. How often the son reminds one of the father, the daughter of the mother! How often the son walks like his father or grandfather, and how all his muscular movements remind one of his parents' movements! It may be but the toss of the head, the shrug of the shoulder, or the turn of the hand, and yet we recognize at once how strong the similarity is. Add to this the effects of the wonderful laws of hered-

ity, far reaching as they are in their influences, and we are forced to conclude that although men apparently are very different, yet the differences are not nearly so great as we are at first led to suppose.

Is there anything like this to be found in man's mental operations? We think there is. We do not pretend to say how thought is produced. We cannot delve into the innermost recesses of man's mind and describe the workings of his brain, the seat of thought and of all his intellectual faculties; but have not many recent experiences and investigations in this field tended to strengthen the theory that every mental effort is attended by some action of the brain, some activity of the thought producing organ, not muscular perhaps, but something akin to it? If this be the case, cannot the similarity of the majority of persons similarly situated and under like conditions be accounted for in part, and consequently, do not men think alike, or rather, is there not a great similarity in their thoughts for some reason akin to that which makes them walk alike, talk alike and act alike? Is there not some deep fundamental law controlling the genus, governing not only the form and movements, but determining the quality, the character, the functions and the results as well, some deep law that controls the inward life of men as a class as well as their outward life? We submit that it looks very much that way.

Just as we are able to appreciate this tendency of men to follow each other in thought, in act and in deed, so can we appreciate the courage of those men who have from time to time broken away from generally accepted theories and started out on new lines. Even in the every-day occurrences of our lives how we pattern after each other. How apt we are to wear the same kind of clothes cut and made in the same way! This might be more convincing argument if I were addressing the alumni of some Female Seminary; but even we, the sterner sex, who are not supposed to bother ourselves about trivial matters of this sort, must admit that we, too, are slaves to fashion in a way, and that if for no greater reason than our aversion to appear-

ing odd and conspicuous, we follow in the train all the same and become one of the general crowd. How we hesitate before giving forth some new idea that may have occurred to us for fear that it will be laughed at, and we made to appear ridiculous! For the sake of our own comfort and convenience we do just as other people do.

This being the case we cannot help but honor those who have fought these intellectual battles for us, and who are fighting them for us to-day; may we always continue to honor and cherish their names. Bolder and braver than warriors upon the field of battle they have gone forth to war, not with armies of physical strength and power, but to cross swords with ignorance, bigotry and superstition, and standing alone, they have opposed and defied the opinions of the entire world. Oftentimes jeered at and mocked, branded as skeptics and heretics, condemned even by the Church itself, because of the supposed falsity of their teachings, they have gone down to their graves dishonored and condemned for teaching that which in after years was accepted as truth. They stood forth in their day and generation like giants, daring to doubt that which they could not believe to be true, daring to express their doubts and willing to prove their positions. As the mountains overtop the hills of the valley, so they stood above their fellow-men intellectual heroes. Doubt or true skepticism has been the strong incentive to many a genius. What reason is there for the new if the old is all right? None. Why discard the old for the new if the new is no better than the old? They, many of them, doubters, skeptics, saw far into the future. They attacked what they saw wrong in the past and endeavored to correct it.

As seen before, men are slow to change their minds and to take up new theories. When we stop to reflect that three centuries were required to substitute the Arabic method of notation for the old Roman method, we get some sort of an idea of the slow process by which changes of this character are made. The same might be said of many other changes in which

the benefits of such a change were apparent, or at least would seem to have been apparent.

Perhaps no page of history so fully illustrates the difficulties with which new theories were substituted for old ones, as the interesting story of the condemnation of the Copernican Theory and the teachings of Galileo, by people generally and more particularly by many theologians of that period who could not reconcile the rotation of the earth on its axis and theories respecting astronomy with what they conceived to be the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. It was known from the time that these theories were first advanced that they were condemned by the dominant church of that period, but just to what extent has not been known until recently, until the archives of the Vatican were thrown open to Catholics and Protestants, and the records in the case examined, and to-day when we read that the proposition that "the sun is the centre about which the earth revolves" was condemned as "absurd, false in theology and heretical, because absolutely contrary to Holy Scripture," and when we read further that the proposition that "the Earth is not the centre of the Universe and immovable, but has a diurnal motion," is also condemned by the most powerful religious denomination of the time as "absurd, false in philosophy, and from a theologic point of view, at least, opposed to the true faith," we open our eyes in astonishment and wonder that such things could ever have happened. And again, when we find that in 1633 Galileo, by an order of the Pope and by the action of the Inquisition, threatening him with torture, was compelled to admit "the error and heresy of the movement of the earth," we of this day are almost struck dumb with amazement, and while the Church that once made these condemnations has since endeavored to explain them away, the fact remains the same and cannot be controverted. These great men whose names are now known to every schoolboy were skeptics, doubters, reasoners. They could not reconcile the old and absurd theories of astronomy with scientific laws, and they started out in search of the truth on this sub-

ject. And while it is true that they did not find out all that was to be learned on the subject, they, the men condemned as skeptics and heretics, laid the foundations of the science of Modern Astronomy. They, the greatest scientific lights of their age, the one "delivered from persecution by death; the other imprisoned and branded as the worst of unbelievers," went down to their graves humiliated and dishonored. Let it be the duty of us of modern times, the beneficiaries of their great achievements, to honor their names and to perpetuate the great truths they have revealed to us.

And when we read that Galileo "was at last forced to pronounce publicly and on his knees the following recantation: 'I, Galileo, being in my seventieth year, being a prisoner and on my knees and before your eminences, having before my eyes the Holy Gospel, which I touch with my hands, abjure, curse and detest the error and the heresy of the Movement of the Earth,'" let us endeavor to forget that such a thing ever occurred, and that a man of so great and noble a mind should have been forced to such humiliation, and that the history of civilization should contain such a record upon its pages.

Another good example to illustrate the difficulties with which these men of genius had to contend, and one particularly appropriate at this time, is the discovery of America by Columbus. Columbus was a skeptic so far as the teachings of geography of his day were concerned. He doubted the theories laid down by the most learned men of his day with reference to the shape of the earth, and the doubt once raised, he could not rest satisfied until he worked out the true theory of the earth's form and solved the problem to his own satisfaction, notwithstanding the strong condemnations with which his known theories were opposed when first made. The story is too well-known to be dwelt upon in detail and at length, and I simply call it to mind to show with what trials these men had to contend. And while Columbus was never persecuted for false teachings, this was simply because the correctness of his theories was proven by himself beyond cavil or dispute. If failure

had attended his efforts there is no telling what the result would have been in this direction.

And so we might go on at length to show how, one after another, scientists were persecuted and condemned because of the supposed falsity of their teachings. The fact that the teachings of those gone before, condemned and persecuted before, were from time to time shown to be correct, did not in any wise deter those who seemed to think that it was their special mission to persecute men of new ideas. They did not learn to reason that if they were mistaken in one thing they might be in others.

In speaking of the Church as being particularly active in the condemnation of these men, I do not wish to be understood as condemning it simply because it was the Church. The condemnation was general. The people joined in the general cry against them, and the Church of that day being more powerful in temporal affairs than it is to-day, by that means made itself more conspicuous, and upon it by many has been cast the blame for what all the people did. Nor do I wish to be understood as condemning one Church and the people of one Church alone, in these matters. So far as Protestantism and Catholicism of that day were concerned and their views upon these subjects, we take for granted there was very little difference. One writer upon the subject has summed this matter up in the following words: "Nothing is more unjust than to cast especial blame for all this resistance to science upon the Roman Church. The Protestant Church, though rarely able to be so severe, has been more blameworthy. The persecution of Galileo and his compeers by the Older Church was mainly at the beginning of the 17th century. The persecution of Robertson Smith, and Winchell and Woodrow and Toy and the younger professors at Beyrout by various Protestant authorities, was near the end of the 19th century. These earlier persecutions by Catholicism were strictly in accordance with principles held at that time by all religionists, Catholic and Protestant, throughout the world. These latter persecutions by Protestants were in defi-

ance of principles which all Christendom to-day hold, or pretends to hold. And none make louder claim to hold them than the very sects which persecuted these eminent Christian men of our day, whose crime was that they were intelligent enough to accept the science of their time and honest enough to acknowledge it."

Fortunately the day has come, to some religionists at least, when the revelations of science are hailed by them with delight, when scientific truth instead of controverting the truths of the Bible is looked upon as one of the most conclusive witnesses in its behalf. The more we know of Nature and her laws, the higher is our conception of Him who is its author and who governs it and controls it.

Where do we of to-day stand with reference to the many new theories that are being advanced and the many new ideas that are being promulgated? We are loud-mouthed in our condemnation of the men who did not agree with Galileo and who made him recant. We wonder at the stupidity of those who could not see the truth in the Copernican theory of astronomy; but when we put the question to ourselves and ask what would we have done had we lived at that time under those conditions? we really hesitate to say. The chances are that we would have been against them along with the rest. And now let me ask how do the present times differ from those of the day of Galileo and Copernicus? True, we have made wonderful strides since then. Instead of being confined to the meagre knowledge of the worlds and systems immediately around us, the astronomer of to-day goes far off into the realms of space and opens up for the conception of the human mind fields for research and investigation almost infinite in their vastness and almost limitless in the extent of the interest they excite. Chemistry is no longer confined to magic. The days of the ancient alchemist are no more, and the science of chemistry is to-day almost as certain as the science of mathematics. It has demonstrated clearly that gases found in cellars and mines are *not* evil spirits, that have taken possession of these places, and that

are able to destroy men by the power of their breath. As some one has well expressed it "the days of black magic in which the Devil was supposed to be the principal factor," have been supplanted by "the days of white magic, which brings into service simply the laws of nature." These are the days of Chemistry and Physics when we make electricity carry our burdens and illuminate our homes and streets, when ice is manufactured by machinery, and when we can pour liquified air from one vessel to another, and ere long we may find ourselves drinking liquified oxygen, as a pleasant or healthful beverage. Wherever we turn we see progress, new inventions taking the place of old and useless ones, and, in short, we have a very high opinion of ourselves, and I fear are very much inclined to think that we are very near perfection, and that there is very little room for improvement. In this we will be mistaken. Perfection will never be attained by any mortal, and the chances are that in the next century the world will move on as it has in the past, and that we, in all our boasted greatness, will be as far behind the people of a century hence in knowledge and wisdom, as the people of the last century were behind us of to-day. The great onward flux of the human mind in its attainments and achievements will continue, and the maxim, "The more we know the more we find to be known," will be fully verified. Our times do not differ from those of the days of Galileo except in degree. We are operating on a higher plane, and that is all; but we, some of us at least, still try people for heresy and condemn them, too. We hesitate just as much about adopting new theories now almost as they did in the days of yore. What, let me ask, to illustrate, is the position of the majority of educational institutions on the teachings of Darwin? Many condemn them, some adopt them, others believe them and are afraid to say so. How do we look upon the teachings of Spencer, Huxley and Draper? Ah, we say that we cannot adopt their theories because they do not coincide with our views. Is that an argument that they are wrong? We may find ourselves some day in the same position occupied

by those who condemned Copernicus and Galileo. We may find that we, like many of old, have been wise in our own conceits and have been prone to condemn what we could not understand. I do not pretend to answer these questions nor to say that the teachings of these men who are condemned by many, who are my superiors, are right, and that they should be accepted as such; I simply raise the question for our consideration. Reasoning by analogy we might be led to conclude that they are right, but that is a question that each one must answer for himself.

Not being a theologian, I feel some reluctance in making any attempt to show how skepticism has been beneficial to the Christian Church and her teachings. And yet, inasmuch as all other teachings are of little consequence, except when they tend toward Christianity and are subservient to her, we cannot leave our subject without making some remarks in this direction, and again let me remind you that I am using the term skepticism in its fundamental meaning, and do not for one moment wish to intimate that I, in any way, countenance that sort of doubt that questions the truth of the fundamental principles of Christianity. But around these fundamental principles and based upon them has grown up the Science of Theology—the work of man—or rather the theories of man respecting these principles and their application. No one then, no matter how thoroughly he believes in the Bible and its teachings, will, I take for granted, attempt to set up the theory that all theology is right and true, or that any one system of theology is *all* right and true. On the contrary, being the work of man, it too is liable to be wrong. History shows that it has been wrong, that errors have crept into it just as they have into the science of Astronomy and Chemistry and into all the other works of man? Who have pointed out these wrongs and attempted to rectify them? Men called skeptics in their day, men condemned and burned at the stake, men excommunicated and humiliated, men willing to sacrifice life for what they believed to be truth, and who were willing to stand up for

their convictions at all times and at all hazards. Why, let me ask, should not the teachings of the Church change at least the teachings of the Church with reference to those things not absolutely essential or that do not go to the essence of Christianity? Why should not the Science of Theology change as those sciences pertaining to man's secular life do? Man's temporal wants are constantly changing—his mode of life is constantly changing, his laws and his philosophy are changing, and his religion must be awake to these changes also, otherwise it becomes stagnant, and lifeless; and we feel confident that we can with safety and without making any attack upon Christianity, lay down the proposition that as humanity advances, so will its religion advance and develop. This is fully proven in the first great break made from the teachings of the Mother Church by Luther. The times demanded a change. The day for more freedom had arrived, not suddenly, not, I might say, unexpectedly; but forces had been at work for years tending in the same direction and toward the same end. The break came, and the world will never regret the change. Many subsequent breaks and changes have occurred, none equal in importance to the first great one, but of sufficient importance to prove that the same causes of dissatisfaction will to-day bring about corresponding changes. The life of the Church is helped at times by these innovations, and any church that does not keep pace with them is bound to become inactive, and its usefulness is bound to be diminished. Thus it will be seen that even here the work of the true skeptic results in good, in that to him, as a doubter, the wrong becomes apparent, and he takes steps to rectify it.

But what shall we say of that sort of skepticism not honest in itself, and how can it be argued that it can be the cause of any good either directly or indirectly? Certainly not directly, but we feel that at times it has done good. In science, if it has done nothing more, it has kept the defenders of truth upon the alert, and made them more active in asserting their theories and principles, and in showing the truth of them. Just

as an army may be kept under arms ready for war by a feigned attack of an enemy, so the true scientist may be kept ready to defend any and all attacks that may be made upon his theories. It keeps him awake, as it were, and to this extent, at least, it is a benefit. The same is true in theology. A false teacher cannot harm the Church. For a time he may seem to be doing it an injury; but truth will prevail, and instead of inflicting any serious wrong he simply stirs up those opposed to him to greater activity, and in the end is indirectly the cause of some good.

We all need stirring up occasionally, It does us good to be stirred up in our business once in awhile. Opposition always calls forth greater efforts from the other side than would otherwise have taken place. When one lawyer knows that he is going to be opposed by a brilliant and able lawyer in a case, he always makes more careful preparation for the fight than if one not quite so strong is to appear against him, and the same I take for granted is true of every department of learning. Oppose my scientific theories, and I will put my best foot forth to vindicate them. Oppose my theology, and I will respond to the call for battle on this line with renewed energy even if the attack may be so false as to be absurd and ridiculous.

What harm do you suppose Bob Ingersoll has inflicted upon the cause of Christianity by his attacks upon it? If we consider the ultimate result—I would say none. True he may have some followers, and he may at times seem to be doing the cause injury; but when we take into consideration the renewed activity on the part of the Church, brought about by his absurd opposition to its teachings, and the absurd theories he would substitute for truth, we feel inclined to laugh at his efforts, and to say that the balance is not, at least, against the Church.

The age in which we live to-day is a peculiar one. Never before in the history of the world have the energies of men been so actively engaged in search of truth as they are to-day, and never before have there been so many doubters and skeptics according to our definition of them as we find at this time. Old theories in the sciences are being doubted, questioned and

proven to be false, and new ones substituted in their places. Every new theory advanced is attacked, analyzed, and investigated. If it stands the test well and good; if not it is discarded, and something better looked for to take its place. Old systems of philosophy are being in part swept away because not satisfactory, and new ones brought forth to take their places. We are undergoing constant changes. New inventions and contrivances are almost daily changing our mode of life. We are passing through an age of such intense realism that even our literature is affected by it, an age when fact rather than fancy is demanded, and an age when everything must bear the stamp of truth before it is accepted. There may be desirable limits even to this sort of thing, but we feel that in the end good will be the result. Let the work go on, let men doubt, let them hesitate, let them consider, let them continue to work for and seek for the truth, let them if they will tear from the brows of our heroes the laurels that we have been fondly placing there, and let them topple over the monuments that we have erected in their honor, if done for the cause of truth, to which, and for which, we should be willing at all times to sacrifice our feelings, and upon whose altars we should always be willing to lay our sentiments, a votive offering. Let come the genuine doubts of the true skeptic, they can but clear the truth of that which is non-essential, and let come the doubts of the false skeptic, for they can but ground the truth more securely upon its foundations and increase its power by the contrast.

In conclusion, fellow-alumni, let me say that it is our duty as college men to help the world to fight these intellectual battles, —our duty to help the world to get away from old fogyism and all that is false, and to help to bring about greater liberality and freedom of thought, and to be the *leaders* in progress rather than the *followers*.

The broad liberal culture of our alma mater, especially, prepares *us* for this work, and I am glad to say that she is doing her part in this direction grandly and nobly. Long may she live and prosper, the disseminator of truth, and truth of that liberal kind which the world always stands in need of.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA. By William Garden Blaikie, D.D., L.L.D., New College, Edinburg. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1893. Price $1.50.

THE FIRST BOOK OF KINGS. By. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F. R. S., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge: Archdeacon of Westminster. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1893. Price $1.50.

EZRA, NEHEMIAH AND ESTHER. By Walter F. Adeney, M. A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Church History, New College, London. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1893. Price $1.50.

These three volumes belong to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible" and are possessed of the same attractive features which distinguish the previous volumes of this admirable series of expository works.

The Exposition of the Book of Joshua by Professor Blaikie is written from a conservative standpoint, "Rationalists," he says, "may count us wrong in believing that the Hebrew historical books are more than Hebrew annals—are the records of a Divine manifestation. But they cannot hold us unreasonable or inconsistent if, believing this, we believe in the miracles which the books record." "As to the hand of a reviser or revisers in the book," he also says, "we see no difficulty in allowing for such. We can conceive an authorized reviser expanding speeches, but thoroughly in the line of the speakers, or inserting explanatory remarks as to places, or as to practices that had prevailed 'unto this day.' But it is atrocious to be told of revisers coloring statements and modifying facts in the interests of religious parties, or even in the interest of truth itself. Any alterations in the way of revision seem to have been very limited, otherwise we should not find in the existing text those awkward joinings of different documents which are not in perfect accord. Whoever the revisers were, they seem to have judged it best to leave these things as they found them, rather than incur the responsibility of altering what had already been written." The Exposition itself is throughout highly interesting and instructive, and will prove profitable reading even to those who may not at all points agree with the author in the view he takes of some of the incidents which he seeks to explain.

In his Exposition of the First Book of Kings, Archdeacon Farrar is much less conservative than Professor Blaikie in his treatment of the Book of Joshua. "The Bible," he maintains, "was written in human language, by men for men. It was written mainly in Judea, by Jews, for Jews. '*Scripture*,' as the old theological rule said, '*is the sense of Scripture*,' and the sense of Scripture can only be ascertained by the methods of study and the rules of criticism without which no ancient document or literature can be even approximately understood. In these respects the Bible cannot be arbitrarily or exceptionally treated. No *a priori* rules can be devised for its elucidation. It is what it is, not what we might have expected it to be." He moreover claims that "There is scarcely a single competent scholar who does not now admit that the Hexateuch is a composite structure; that much of the Levitical legislation which was once called Mosaic, is in reality an aftergrowth which *in its present form* is not earlier than the days of the Prophet Ezekiel; that the Book of Deuteronomy belongs, in its present form, whatever older elements it may contain, to the era of Hezekiah's or Josiah's reformation; that the Books of Zechariah and Isaiah are not homogeneous, but preserve the writings of more prophets than their titles imply; that only a small section of the Psalter was the work of David; that the Book of Ecclesiastes was not the work of King Solomon; that most of the Book of Daniel belongs to the era of Antiochus Epiphanes; and so forth." Of the Book of Kings, he says: "It must not be imagined that the late compilation of the book, or its subsequent recensions, or the dogmatic coloring which it may have insensibly derived from the religious systems and organizations of days subsequent to the Exile, have in the least affected the main historic veracity of the Kingly annals. They may have influenced the omissions and the moral estimates, but the events themselves are in every case confirmed when we are able to compare them with any records and monuments of Phœnicia, Moab, Egypt, Assyria, or Babylon." As regards the Exposition of the book before us, it is almost all that could be desired. On every page it gives evidence of superior scholarship and deep spiritual insight. It is, moreover, possessed of those attractive qualities of style which characterize all the writings of the author, and make them such delightful reading. Of the volumes of the series to which it belongs it is one of the very best.

The Exposition of the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, by Professor Adeney is also highly meritorious. The thirty-five chapters of which the volume is composed, are all full of interesting and instructive matter and throw much light on those portions of Scripture to which they relate, and which they aim to explain. The work is in every respect worthy a place alongside the other volumes of the series to which it belongs.

We would, inded, heartily commend all these volumes to our Ministerial brethren as rich in thought and as mentally and spiritually stimulating. The careful study of them could scarcely fail to make the pulpit utterances of ministers generally not only more interesting but also more edifying.

THE DEACONESS AND HER VOCATION. By Bishop Thoburn. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. 1893. Price 60 cents.

This little volume is made up of four sermons and addresses which treat respectively of The Deaconess and Her Work, The Modern Deaconess, The Deaconess Movement, and The Deaconess and Her Vocation. These discourses give much interesting and valuable information on the subject to which they relate. Those interested in this subject will find the volume especially worthy their attention. Its general circulation among Christian men and women could scarcely fail to be productive of good results.

REVISED NORMAL LESSONS. By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut. New York. Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. 1893. Price in Paper, 25 cents; in Cloth, 40 cents.

This book has been prepared for the instruction of Normal Classes in the Sunday-School, and is admirably adapted to the purpose for which it is intended. If a Normal class could be formed in every Sunday-school and these lessons were carefully studied by the members of the class there can be no doubt much good would result. In every Sunday-school such a class is needed for the preparation of the teachers if Sunday-school instruction is to be made more effective and truly edifying.

THE STORY OF A LETTER; Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. By John H. Vincent. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. 1893. Price 20 cents.

This little booklet forms part of a series designated "The Book of Books Series. Its purpose is to give a brief account of the origin and contents of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians and to awaken interest in its study. In appendices the arguments in favor of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, and the Epistle according to the revised version are given. The story of the Epistle is interestingly and instructively told.

THE METHODIST YEAR BOOK FOR 1893. Edited by Rev. A. B. Sanford, M. A. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. Price 10 cents.

This Year Book gives a large amount of useful and interesting information concerning the denomination in whose interest it is issued. It will be found a valuable handbook not only by members of the Methodist Church, but by all who would keep themselves well informed as regards religious work and progress in our country.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., London. MARK—LUKE. Octavo, 460 pp., cloth. New York and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1893. Price, $1.50.

Dr. Parker's "People's Bible" is the record of his own teaching. Ministers sometimes find a difficulty in knowing how to instruct the people in the Bible as a whole, or in sections. In preaching the textual method is, for the most part used, i. e., a single verse is made the subject of a sermon, or at times several verses. But it is felt that the people need instruction in larger portions of the Bible, or in the Bible as a whole. We have in these volumes Dr. Parker's method, and his experience is worth a great deal. He seems to have a special qualification for this kind of Biblical instruction, and we think his work is a great help for pastors, as well as adapted to general reading. He publishes the prayers he used, as a preparation of mind and heart for the study that follows. We might perhaps criticise these prayers, one feels their inferiority as compared with the liturgical prayers of the church, they are often purely didactic, at times a mere meditation, and we feel that often one of the good old collects would be better. But there is also much in them that is excellent, and they constantly remind the student of the Bible of the importance of prayer in the study of the Scriptures. This volume on Mark and Luke is quite up to the standard of his preceding volumes. Dr. Parker's method might be used with great advantage, we think, in the weekly-prayer-meeting, the Bible-class, or even in one of the regular services on the Lord's day. For, say what we will, there is a lamentable lack of acquaintance with the Bible in our day. Ministers trust to the reading of it in the family, but this we fear is much neglected. From the example given of our Saviour it would seem that something like this method of Dr. Parker's was used in the Synagogue worship. He read a section, or a whole lesson, and then closed the book and commented upon it. Those who follow the church have this want largely supplied in the Pericopes, but they are necessarily limited, and leave room for a still more general study of the Bible, such as is set forth in these volumes of Dr. Parker. We commend them for this purpose.